

Final
Environmental Impact Statement
Volume III

Military Training Use of National Forest Lands
Camp Shelby, Mississippi

Response to Comments



July 1994

Department of the Army

National Guard Bureau
and

Mississippi Army National Guard

19950620 150

DISCLAIMER NOTICE



THIS DOCUMENT IS BEST QUALITY AVAILABLE. THE COPY FURNISHED TO DTIC CONTAINED A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF PAGES WHICH DO NOT REPRODUCE LEGIBLY.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave Blank)		2. REPORT DATE July 1994		3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Military Training Use of National Forest Lands, Camp Shelby, Mississippi Response to Comments				5. FUNDING NUMBERS MIPRs NGMS-CF-MIPR-92-10; NGMS-CF-MIPR-92-11; NGMS-CF-MIPR-93-02; ONGMS MOE 94008	
6. AUTHOR(S) Harold E. Balbach, David L. Price, William R. Whitworth, Manroop K. Chawla, and Eric R. Schreiber					
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratories (USACERL) P.O. Box 9005 Champaign, IL 61826-9005				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER SR 95/10, Vol III	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Camp Shelby Training Site ATTN: NGMS-FMO-E 1001 Lee Avenue Camp Shelby, MS 39407				10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Copies are available from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161.					
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.				12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) The Department of the Army, National Guard Bureau, proposes to continue Special Permit use of approximately 117,000 acres of National Forest land as an integral part of Camp Shelby, MS. This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) discusses six alternatives, concentrating on threatened and endangered species, biodiversity, forest fragmentation, soil loss, timber supply, recreation opportunities, and the quality of life for local residents. The conclusion was that no alternative, with one exception, will jeopardize the continued existence of the gopher tortoise; that proposed erosion control measures will be adequate to control the most serious effects of soil movement; that the Forest Service would be able to integrate the proposed timber removal into their existing sales program if this removal were spread over several years; and that the military presence can coexist with civilian recreational use. The Army's preferred alternative will allow both tank gunnery and battalion tracked vehicle maneuvers to take place simultaneously. This Final EIS was filed with the Environmental Protection Agency in August 1994 and a Record of Decision issued in December 1994 selected an action combining aspects of several alternatives. This document does not represent a pending action, and the public response period expired in October 1994.					
14. SUBJECT TERMS environmental impact analysis military training environmental planning Camp Shelby, MS				15. NUMBER OF PAGES 608	
				16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR		

Military Training Use of National Forest Lands Camp Shelby, Mississippi

by

Harold E. Balbach

David L. Price

William R. Whitworth

Manroop K. Chawla

Eric R. Schreiber

The Department of the Army, National Guard Bureau, proposes to continue Special Permit use of approximately 117,000 acres of National Forest land as an integral part of Camp Shelby, MS. This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) discusses six alternatives, concentrating on threatened and endangered species, biodiversity, forest fragmentation, soil loss, timber supply, recreation opportunities, and the quality of life for local residents. The conclusion was that no alternative, with one exception, will jeopardize the continued existence of the gopher tortoise; that proposed erosion control measures will be adequate to control the most serious effects of soil movement; that the Forest Service would be able to integrate the proposed timber removal into their existing sales program if this removal were spread over several years; and that the military presence can coexist with civilian recreational use. The Army's preferred alternative will allow both tank gunnery and battalion tracked vehicle maneuver to take place at the same time. A decision that combines aspects of more than one alternative may be selected to allow the agencies to balance environmental impacts with achieving the Army's training needs.

This Final EIS was filed with the Environmental Protection Agency in August 1994, and a Record of Decision was issued in December 1994, selected an action combining aspects of several alternatives. The present document does not represent a pending action, and the public response period for this document expired in October 1994.

Accession For	
DEIS GRARI	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DEIS TAE	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

Foreword

This report was prepared for the Mississippi Army National Guard, the National Guard Bureau, and the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Environment, Safety, and Occupational Health) with funding through the Mississippi National Guard under military interdepartmental purchase requests NGMS-CF-MIPR-92-10, dated 28 May 92; NGMS-CF-MIPR-92-11, dated 28 August 1992; NGMS-CF-MIPR-93-02, dated 23 February 1993; and ONGMS MOE 94008, dated 11 March 1994, "Preparation of Camp Shelby Final Environmental Impact Statement." The Mississippi National Guard technical monitor was LTC Robert Lee, NGMS-FMO-E.

The work was performed by the Environmental Resources (ENR) team of the Environmental Division (EN), U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratories (USACERL). The principal investigator was Dr. Harold E. Balbach who is now assigned to the Planning and Mission Impact Division (LL-P) of the Land Management Laboratory (LL). Robert M. Lacey is Acting Chief (LL-P), and Dr. William D. Severinghaus, Operations Chief (LL) and William D. Goran is Chief, CECER-LL.

LTC David J. Rehbein is Commander and Acting Director, USACERL, and Dr. Michael J. O'Connor is Technical Director.

The authors wish to acknowledge the significant contributions made to the Draft EIS by Jo Culbertson and R. Marvin Marlatt of USACERL; the development of Geographic Information System analyses and figures by Bob Lozar, Ed Delisio, and Bob Feeney of USACERL; the preparation of the cultural resources surveys and analyses by Charles Moorehead and Neil Robison of the Mobile, AL, District Office of the Corps of Engineers; and extensive support in reading, revising, and supplementing the Draft and Final EIS by LTC Bob Lee, COL Leland Redmond, COL Woodrow Lyon, LTC G.E. Davis, LTC Lonnie Rayburn, and numerous other officers, enlisted personnel, and civilian employees of the Army National Guard Bureau, Mississippi Army National Guard, and Camp Shelby. John White, formerly of the U.S. Forest Service, provided invaluable assistance in hundreds of instances where National Forest policy, programs, procedures, and plans are discussed. Thomas Craven, of the Mobile District, Corps of Engineers, was also a critical participant in the process from its initiation until his retirement, during the last stages of document finalization. Mike Eubanks assumed this important role for the last months of document assembly, printing, and distribution. In Chapter 7 of the EIS, the names and contributions of many of the scores of participants in the EIS data collection, research, and writing process are described in slightly more detail. Without the assistance of these persons, and others unnamed, successful completion of the project would not have been possible.

VOLUME III
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
Final Environmental Impact Statement
Military Training Use of National Forest Lands
Camp Shelby, Mississippi

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
PUBLIC REVIEW MISUNDERSTANDING RESPONSES	3
#1 - Maneuver areas will be using gopher tortoise priority soils.	3
#2 - Closure of Camp Shelby would be at little cost.	4
#3 - The proposed action will result in more soldiers training at Camp Shelby.	5
#4 - There will be no hunting in the proposed maneuver area.	6
#5 - The proposed action will involve expansion of Camp Shelby from its present configuration.	6
#6 - The Leaf River Wildlife Management Area (LRWMA) is a wildlife refuge.	7
#7 - Alternative 3B is the environmentally desirable alternative. It will benefit threatened and endangered species and wildlife in general; is adequate for the battalion task force level training; and is more than adequate for the training needs of Camp Shelby.	8
#8 - There should be a change in the overall use of the base as a result of recent changes in global politics.	9
#9 - The proposed action will destroy the forest and wildlife dependent upon it. These cannot be replaced. Irreparable damage will be done to the environment and nothing will be left for generations. Lands for hunting and other public use as well as the revenue source for local school systems would also be lost forever.	10
#10 - The Leaf River Wildlife Management Area is a pristine area.	11
#11 - The De Soto National Forest is a pristine longleaf pine ecosystem and forest.	12
#12 - The proposed action involves swapping or exchanging of land between the Department of Army and the US Forest Service or the acquisition of title by the Mississippi Army National Guard of 116,000 acres of De Soto National Forest.	12
#13 - There will be live firing of weapons in the proposed tracked vehicle maneuver area.	13
#14 - The Leaf River Wildlife Management Area will be ruined if the proposed action is implemented.	14
#15 - The Black Creek Wilderness is a natural wilderness area that will be destroyed or greatly affected if the proposed action is implemented.	14

Table of Contents (Continued)

#16 - The proposed battalion task force level armor training should be done in the west or southwest "...in the desert which is a wasteland and would incur less environmental damage than if the training were done in the Southeastern Mississippi."	15
#17 - Everything in the proposed tracked vehicle maneuver area will be destroyed if the proposed action is implemented.	16
#18 - The impact area is a nearly pristine area.	16
#19 - There currently is no tracked vehicle maneuver training south of the Eight Mile Road (FS 303).	17
#20 - Non eye-safe target acquisition lasers will be used in the proposed tracked vehicle maneuver areas.	18
#21 - There will be significant additional noise as a result of implementing the new tracked vehicle maneuver areas.	18
#22 - The primary goals of the National Forests are to protect forest land for the use and enjoyment of the public, and it is set aside for wilderness, wildlife, and recreation use.	19
#23 - The proposed action will result in the takeover of the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area by the Mississippi National Guard.	20
#24 - The Special Use permit Area is almost the entire De Soto National Forest.	20
#25 - The proposed action will result in significantly increased troop numbers and higher levels of training activity, thus resulting in significantly increased economic benefits to the area.	21
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS	23
#1 Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks (John Burris)	25
#2 U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)	36
#3 U.S. Department of the Interior (James Lee)	80
#4 Mississippi Bureau of Marine Fisheries (Philip Lewis)	85
#6 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Allan Mueller)	86
#7 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Heinz Mueller)	87
#8 Mississippi Department of Archives and History (Roger Walker)	94
#10 Mississippi Chapter, Sierra Club (David Lentz)	95
#11 Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (Richard Martin)	99
#12 Citizens for Camp Shelby (Johnny McArthur)	101
#13 Mississippi Society of American Foresters (Jerry Pelly)	108
#14 Pine Woods Audubon Chapter (James Puckett)	110
#15 Alabama Audubon Council (Elberta Reid)	122
#16 Mississippi Wildlife Federation (Elizabeth Rooks)	123
#17 Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund, Inc. (Robert Wiygul)	128
#18 Eugene Abernathy	133

Table of Contents (Continued)

#19	Mrs. Aubrey Adams	134
#20	James Alexander	135
#21	Kathy Allday	137
#22	Perry County Board of Supervisors (John Anderson)	139
#23	Paul Anderson	141
#24	Virginia Austin	142
#25	Greg Bachhuber	143
#26	Dennis Bankston	145
#27	Kathy Bankston	148
#28	Jack Bartlett	149
#29	Mrs. Alan Barton	150
#30	Marion Beaird	151
#31	Gail Bishop	152
#32	Mr. and Mrs. Tony Bond	153
#33	Edna Boone et al.	155
#34	John Bradley, Jr.	157
#35	Margarite Breland et al.	158
#36	Sheri Brewer	163
#37	Richard Broome	164
#38	Lin Brown	165
#39	Ed Burns	166
#40	Burmah Burris	167
#41	Rosa Bustin	168
#42	Malcolm Byrd	170
#43	Mrs. Charles Carson	173
#44	Arlene Cates	175
#45	Jean Chunn	176
#46	Wayne Claude	177
#47	Burke Cochran	178
#48	Stuart Colie	179
#49	Lucy K. Conner	183
#50	Richard Conville	184
#51	Deborah Cooley	185
#52	Ron Cox	188
#53	Stephen Craft	190
#54	Carol Cubberley	193
#55	John Curley	194
#56	Caleb Dana	195
#57	Thomas Dana	196
#58	Carolyn D'Aquilla	199
#59	Sandy Davenport	201

Table of Contents (Continued)

#60	M.G. Davis	204
#61	Denny Denton	207
#62	Walter Denton	208
#63	Walter and Virginia Denton	209
#64	Reid Derr	214
#65	Rod Dickson-Rishel	215
#66	Frank Dix	219
#67	Edward Donovan	221
#68	Jim Dossett	222
#70	R.D. Eastman	223
#71	Carmen Engram	224
#72	Beverly Evans	225
#73	Richard Felder	226
#74	Elizabeth Fincher	228
#75	Gloria Fisher	230
#76	Jason and Evelyn Floyd	231
#77	Jean Todd Freeman	232
#78	Lena Fuller	238
#79	Rubye Fulton	241
#80	Mary Gandy	242
#81	C. Gannon	243
#82	Louise and Dan Gardner	244
#83	Anne Garrott	246
#84	Larry Gates	247
#85	Terrie Gates	250
#86	Pat and Terry Gibbs	252
#87	Joseph Giliberti	254
#88	Sarah Gillespie	256
#89	Becky Gillette and Roger Danley	257
#90	Doris Gillie	259
#91	Kim Gillie	260
#92	Nathan Gillie	263
#93	James Gosselink	266
#94	Carolyn Graves	269
#95	Clayton Griffith	270
#96	Annie Gunn	271
#97	William Guyton	272
#98	Robert Hall	274
#99	Peter Hirsch	275
#100	Thomas Hale	276
#101	Marcus Hammack	279

Table of Contents (Continued)

#102	Wesley Hanks	280
#103	Steve Hasty	281
#104	Dan Hembree	282
#105	Nona Herbert	284
#106	G.S. Hicks	285
#107	Merrienne Hill	286
#108	Jean Hilton	287
#109	Joe Houston	288
#110	T.L. and Chris Howell	289
#111	Alan Huffman	294
#112	Dan Hughes	295
#113	Henry Humphrey	296
#114	Rosemary Hyde	298
#115	H. Edwin Jackson	299
#116	Lawrence Johnson	302
#117	Stewart Kallam	303
#118	Susan Keith	304
#119	Florence Koopman	305
#120	Frank Koopman	306
#121	Patricia Kulick	308
#122	W.D. Langenwaller	309
#123	Jeanne Lebow	310
#124	Donna Lee	311
#125	James Lee	313
#126	Justin Lee	317
#127	Robert E. Lee	320
#128	Tina Lipscomb	321
#129	Louise Love	322
#130	Allen Lowrie	323
#131	Faye Mahaffey	324
#132	Louise and Edward Maslowski	325
#133	Betty Mason	326
#134	Carolyn Masters	328
#135	David Masters	329
#136	Bryant Mather	330
#137	Wayne McCardle	331
#138	Mrs. Pat McDaniel	332
#139	Ms. Sandra McDaniel	333
#140	Randolf McDannald	334
#141	Ms. Helen McGinnis	335
#142	Mark McIntosh	338

Table of Contents (Continued)

#143	William McKell	339
#144	Sara McLeod	340
#145	Randall McPherson	341
#146	David Miller	342
#147	T. Miller	343
#148	Claire Morrison	344
#149	Corley Morse	345
#150	Michael Murdock	346
#151	Anna Musgrave	347
#152	J.E. and Reba Napier	348
#153	R.M. Napier	349
#154	Wenda Napier	350
#156	Mrs. Doug Odom	351
#157	Michele and Terry Odom	353
#158	Debra Oglesbee	354
#159	Shirley Pace	356
#160	Mary Page	357
#161	Barbara Parker	358
#162	Vernon Patterson	359
#163	Oscar Paulson	360
#164	Mrs. Eula B. Pearce	361
#165	Phil Lechner	365
#166	Gordon Pearce	366
#167	Lois Anne Pearce	367
#168	Violet Pearce	368
#169	Doris Pearson	371
#170	Mrs. T.W. Perrot	372
#171	Zack Phillips	373
#172	John D. Pickering et al.	374
#173	Hart Pillow	376
#174	Thomas Pitts	378
#175	Joann Pool	382
#176	Thomas Price	383
#177	James Puckett	400
#178	Charles Raley	402
#179	Franklin Rawlings	403
#180	Laurie Recore	405
#181	Elizabeth Reese	406
#182	Peggy Rhodes	408
#183	Troy Rich	409
#184	Bryan Richard	411

Table of Contents (Continued)

#185	Susan and Bill Richter	413
#186	William and Camellia Ricks	415
#187	Mr. A.A. Robinson	417
#188	Ms. Sarah L. Rowe	418
#189	Susan Scott	420
#190	James and Jane Sharp	424
#191	Steve Shepard	425
#192	Robert Shows	426
#194	Douglas Sims	427
#195	E.L. and Margaret Slater	429
#196	T. Mark Sledge	431
#197	Robert Smistik	432
#198	Benita Smith	437
#199	Robert Sneed	438
#200	Lydia Snell	439
#201	Charles Streuly	440
#202	Patricia Taylor	441
#203	James Tims	442
#204	Sally Todd	447
#205	Joan Trahan	448
#206	Jeff Troyka	449
#207	Robbie Lindsey Troyka	450
#208	Jo Tuepken	451
#209	Inez Tynes	452
#210	Virginia Valerine	453
#211	David Varnado	455
#212	Charles Venus, Jr.	457
#213	Virginia Von Seutter	458
#214	Cile Waite	459
#215	Paul and Marie Walley	462
#216	Gary Walters	463
#217	Everette Ward	466
#218	Arvid Watts	467
#219	Stephen Weems	468
#220	David Whatley	469
#221	Patricia White	470
#222	James Wilkinson	471
#223	C.T. Williams et al.	472
#224	Donald Williams	474
#225	Brenda Williamson	475
#226	David Williamson	477

Table of Contents (Continued)

#227	Jerry Windham	478
#228	Douglas and Elizabeth Wolfe	481
#229	Forrest Wood, Jr.	482
#230	Donald Woodall	483
#231	Wilma Woodbridge	484
#232	Lamar Wray	486
#234	Elizabeth M. Anglin	487
#235	Anonymous	489
#236	Joe Spell	490
#237	John Baum, Jonathan Baum	494
#238	Mitch Bosarge	496
#239	Fred Boudreaux	497
#240	Jamie Boyll	498
#241	Rex J. Brannan	499
#242	Tom Brock	500
#243	Ott Brockman	501
#244	Stan Budraitis	502
#245	John A. Burnam	503
#246	Chester Burnham	504
#247	Austin Ferrill, Jr.	506
#248	Deborah J. Callahan	507
#249	Jessie L. Cannon	508
#250	Preston M. Cochran	509
#252	Milam Cotten	511
#253	J.F. Coyne	512
#254	Ross Dodds	513
#255	Sandra Dalrymple	515
#256	Larry Joe Daughtry	516
#260	Joel Dougherty	517
#261	Lynne Dougherty	518
#263	James Fairly	521
#264	Bill Ferrell	522
#265	Jean Ford	523
#267	C.D. Galey	524
#271	Jess Hughes	525
#272	Michael D. Gilpin	526
#274	Olivia Graves	527
#275	John K. Gray	528
#276	Jeanette S. Hall	529
#277	Mrs. R.W. Heidelberg	530
#278	Terry Herrington	531

Table of Contents (Continued)

#280	William S. Howell	532
#281	Robert V. Hudson	533
#282	Curtis B. James	534
#283	Don Johnson	536
#286	Doris C. Knausz	537
#287	Penny Kochtitzky	538
#288	Allen D. Lantz	539
#289	William R. Lindsley, Jr.	541
#290	Gary Loper	542
#291	Robert L. Loper	543
#293	Ann Lyon	544
#294	Joseph Lyon	545
#295	Robert D. Mason	546
#297	L.A. McGinnis	547
#298	Thomas A. McLain	548
#299	Mrs. G.F. Mixon, Jr.	549
#300	Donnie F. Myers, Jr.	550
#301	Eric B. Nye	551
#302	Stewart Odom	552
#303	Louis F. Pace	554
#305	Eilleen D. Payne	555
#306	Tim Phalen	556
#307	J.B. Simonton	557
#308	Frank Polk	558
#309	Joan Rains	559
#310	C.E. Rawls	560
#311	William K. Ray	561
#312	J.E.H. Robiller	562
#313	James A. Rogers	564
#314	Brett Shank	565
#315	Frances Simmons	566
#316	Larry Sisk	567
#317	Susan A. Slade	569
#318	Nola I. Smee	570
#319	Mrs. Frances Price Smith	571
#320	Charles Speed	572
#321	Allen T. Steed	573
#322	Richard M. Stone	574
#323	Garland W. Sullivan	575
#324	Frank Tatum, Jr.	576
#325	John M. Tatum, Jr.	577

Table of Contents (Continued)

#326	Mark W. Thomas, Sr.	578
#327	Elaine Tisack	579
#328	Sam Tisack	580
#329	Gene Touchstone	581
#330	G.D. Williamson	582
#331	J.F. Tatum	583
#332	Gene Walters	584
#334	Tom White	585
#335	Rodney G. Wilkinson	587
#336	Cecil L. Winn	588
#338	Sydney Anderson	589
#339	Charles Eppling	590
#340	Robert Myers, Jr.	591
#341	Leo Potvin	593
#342	Henry E. Thompson	594
#343	Merle Spann	598

Volume III

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT

INTRODUCTION

Volume III of the Final Environmental Impact Statement on continued military use of National Forest Lands at Camp Shelby, Mississippi is devoted to an examination of comments submitted by government agencies, interest groups, and members of the general public following distribution of the Draft EIS. More than 2,000 comments were received from more than 300 persons and groups. They came in the form of letters, written comments on forms provided at the public meetings on the Draft EIS, and oral statements provided to the court reporters available at the 1992 public meetings. Many persons provided comments several times, through different modes. The official comment period was extended by 30 days to accommodate this extensive flow of questions and statements of concern. In practice, every comment was accepted, no matter when received. The preparers of the EIS wish to thank all those who commented. The receipt of, and response to, these comments is a vital part of the response to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. Your comments, questions, and suggestions have, we believe, assisted greatly in our attempts to make the Final EIS more complete and more useful as a tool to assist the decision making process...the primary purpose of the document.

Part I -MISUNDERSTANDINGS

Early in the examination of this voluminous correspondence, it became clear that scores, perhaps hundreds, of comments were based, in whole or in part, on a misunderstanding or incorrect belief about the nature or extent or likely consequences of the proposed action. The preparers believe that most of these errors were, in fact, expressed correctly in the text of the EIS itself, and that the misperceptions were the result of word of mouth transmission, incorrect reporting in local newspapers, and newsletters which spread the erroneous information. Rather than re-explaining to each of these persons, separately, the nature of the incorrectly held concept, twenty-five of the most frequently-voiced underlying misperceptions were described in a longer form, with a more complete description. These are termed "misconceptions" in the response to individual comments, and they are numbered 1 through 25 for convenience. No denegration of any person is intended by the use of this term, and it is, here, considered synonymous with misunderstanding or misperception. The subjects of these range from the belief that some type of land exchange is still proposed between the Army and the US Forest Service (Misunderstanding 12), through the belief that the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area is a wildlife refuge (Misunderstanding 6) or a virgin wilderness (Misunderstanding 9), to the misunderstanding that large increases in troops and equipment are proposed (Misunderstanding 3) and that economic benefit to the area is a major justification for the action (Misunderstanding 25).

The first part of Volume III is devoted to a description of these 25 misunderstandings or misconceptions, and the preparers' explanation of why they are believed to be incorrect.

Part 2 - Response to Public Comment

Almost all of Volume III is devoted to public comments and the proponent's response to them. Since there were, as mentioned above, more than 2,000 comments and questions, this occupies a considerable space. preparers believe the space occupied is well spent, however. Together with the scoping meetings held at the beginning of the EIS process, this influx of comment is the primary means by which the focus and content of the EIS is made to reflect the interests and concerns of all publics. Some groups, such as certain government agencies, are required to comment, others, such as public interest groups, are specifically invited to comment, and the general public is also encouraged, by public notices and meetings, to raise concerns and ask questions. The number and variety of comments has helped, we believe, to greatly improve the quality of the Final EIS.

In responding to comments, the preparers have several choices. It would be normal to group comments into a few dozen categories, and provide answers for each category. In this instance, however, it was decided to provide a specific response to each question raised by each person. This allows much greater specificity, and small variations which raise additional issues have received some degree of individual treatment.

For the next several hundred pages, the following protocol has been followed: The original letter, as received, is reproduced on the left half of page. Each commentor has been assigned a reference number, from 1 through 343¹, and the separate questions from one commentor are also numbered. For example, the first question from the first commentor is numbered 1:1, and the tenth question from the 77th commentor is numbered 77:10, etc. These are the numbers which are typed along the right side of the original letter, along with a vertical line showing which words or lines comprise the question, as separated from the rest of the letter. The response to that question or comment appears on the right side of the page, coded with the same number.

In many letters, there are introductory words or sentences which do not either ask a question or make a statement relevant to the proposed action. These may not be numbered or answered. For those which are considered comments and are answered, the answer may take several forms. The first is "Comment noted." This is used whenever a person has made a statement of opinion or position on an issue. In general, the preparers cannot and will not argue with any person's opinion on any issue. Another form of response is a reference to another (previously numbered) comment and response. This is used when the issue raised is identical to, or substantially similar to, an issue already asked and answered. It is used much more frequently toward the end of the volume, because more questions have already been raised, and no slight is intended. A reference to a misunderstanding or misconception statement may also be made at the same time, and in the same manner. Separate answers or responses are prepared when a question has been raised for the first time, or raises issues not previously addressed, or combines different concerns in a way not previously encountered. These responses, especially lengthy responses, are more common in the first section of the volume, where the issues are first raised. Finally, many responses are combinations of a "comment noted," a written response, and references to previous responses and/or to misconception statements.

¹ Many numbers have been omitted as a result of combining several different comment submissions from the same commentor, e.g., letter and oral statement. A list of these "unused" numbers includes: 5, 9, 69, 155, 193, 233, 251, 257, 258, 259, 262, 266, 268, 269, 270, 273, 279, 284, 285, 292, 296, 304, 333, and 337.

PUBLIC REVIEW MISUNDERSTANDING RESPONSES

MISUNDERSTANDING #1 - Maneuver areas will be using gopher tortoise priority soils.

RESPONSE

Gopher tortoise (Gopherus polyphemus) habitat occurs throughout the De Soto National Forest. *The Gopher Tortoise (Gopherus polyphemus) Recovery Plan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Southeastern Region, 1990*, defines the immediate recovery objective as an average of five gopher tortoise burrows per hectare of priority soils. Priority soils are defined as deep sands (sandy soils over 1.52 meters deep). There are an estimated 12,000-18,000 acres of priority soils (Eustis-Troup Soil Series) on the De Soto National Forest with an estimated 5300 acres scattered throughout the Camp Shelby permit area. Gopher tortoise colony sites and priority soils are avoided in all alternatives.

Maneuvering will not be permitted on priority soils. A minimal acreage of priority soils has already been or is proposed to be modified in order to conduct the desired military operations. Such usage is limited to small areas required for proposed or existing roads and trails. For example, in Alternative 1, there are approximately 1900 acres of gopher tortoise priority soils within the outer boundary. Of this total, only 51 acres might be modified through timber removal or road construction, while the remaining 1850 acres will not be affected. No tracked vehicle maneuvering will be occurring on the priority soils, which will continue to be managed as recommended in the gopher tortoise recovery plan. The affected priority soils have previously been trained on or modified through road construction to varying degrees.

Those 51 acres of priority soils affected are not occupied either by gopher tortoise colonies or isolated individuals at the present time, and primarily occur adjacent to existing roads and/or wetland crossings. Boundaries in each of the other action alternatives have also been adjusted to accommodate the gopher tortoise and avoid priority soils. In addition, the recommended 200 foot buffer zone around colony sites and active isolated burrows will further reduce potential military-tortoise conflicts.

The revised training area development proposals associated with the Final EIS avoid all verified priority soils and all tortoise colonies, in compliance with the *Biological Opinion of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) regarding the effects continued/proposed military training activities on the federally threatened gopher tortoise (Gopherus polyphemus)* issued in September 1992 and the *Biological Opinion regarding the effects of the U.S. Forest Service's (FS) proposed issuance of a Special Use Permit (SUP) to the National Guard (NGB) for the reconfiguration of tank maneuver training and new/improved facilities at Camp Shelby, Mississippi, and its effects on the western population of the threatened gopher tortoise (Gopherus polyphemus)*, in October 1993 (both reproduced in Appendix L, Volume 2, of this FEIS). If the use of any portion of these soils has to occur, then mitigation measures will be negotiated through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in cooperation the U.S. Forest Service. Therefore, as priority soils will be avoided wherever possible, no impact is expected to the recovery program on Camp Shelby.

MISUNDERSTANDING #2 - Closure of Camp Shelby would be at little cost.

RESPONSE

Closure of Camp Shelby as a military training site would require a variety of studies be conducted under several statutes. These include but are not limited to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) as amended by the Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act (CERFA), the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Closure of a facility such as Camp Shelby would not be as easy or inexpensive as simply walking away from the site.

Camp Shelby is designated as a major State-operated training site, and its use is a part of the National Military Strategy. Closure would require a reassignment of the missions currently provided by the facility. There would be significant cost associated with movement of the training activities to other DoD facilities in the United States, or a permanent degradation of military capability if they were to be disestablished. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) examining the environmental and socioeconomic effects of transfer of these missions to other facilities as well as the environmental effects of closing the facility, identification and cleanup of potential environmental contamination, and restoration of the environment would also be required before disposal of the facility.

Preparation of an EIS covering these consequences would cost an estimated \$250,000 to \$1,000,000, based on costs for similar DoD base closure actions. This range of cost is probably an underestimate when compared with the cost for this EIS which exceeded \$1,000,000.

Significant steps in preparing land for disposal include the certification that lands are suitable for disposal and the cleanup of contaminated sites to the degree required by any proposed future use. The CERFA amendment to CERCLA requires that the agency disposing of the property identify clean parcels and to expedite the remedial investigation, feasibility study, and clean up of potentially contaminated sites. CERFA also requires that the disposing agency, in cooperation with local communities, identify real property that offers the greatest opportunity for reuse and redevelopment where operations are terminating. The agency must identify uncontaminated property through a process that includes record and title searches, inspection of the property and aerial photographs, interviews, and sampling if appropriate. The process is complete when the concurrence of the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is obtained.

Remedial investigation/feasibility studies (RI/FS) would be conducted on potentially contaminated sites and a Remediation Plan for contaminated sites would be prepared. Public hearings on the remedial actions would be held by the EPA. If the remedial actions are approved, the remedial actions would be conducted.

Remediation could be required for several types of land use areas at Camp Shelby, including impact areas. Average costs for remediation of impact areas where remediation consists only of search and removal of unexploded ordnance to a depth of 24 to 36 inches are between \$6,000 and \$10,000 per acre, based on estimates from the Huntsville Division, Corps of Engineers. If approximately 4,600 acres on the Camp Shelby Training Site has been used as impact areas, the initial costs to clear the site to a depth of 24 to 36 inches could be between \$27,000,000 and \$46,000,000. If the proposed future use of such a former impact area would involve public use, the site would be required to be cleared until such a depth as there were no metal objects detected. For artillery impact areas this depth could be in excess of 10 feet. Costs for clearances of each 24 to 36 inch depth increment would be slightly less than those cited above, about \$4,000 to \$5,000 per acre. All of these costs include only remediation or cleanup for unexploded ordnance. Clearly if closure involved only cleanup of unexploded ordnance, the facility could not be closed for little cost.

MISUNDERSTANDING #3 - The proposed action will result in more soldiers training at Camp Shelby.

RESPONSE

The National Guard Bureau (NGB) has proposed no significant changes for the number, size, or type of units (primarily from Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee) that train at Camp Shelby.

Units from Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee have trained at Camp Shelby for the past 20 years and it is planned that they will continue to do so for the foreseeable future. Losses to the Mississippi Army National Guard force structure are programmed through 1995 (approximately 800 personnel with no losses in Armor or Infantry units).

The Chief of the NGB has stated that the National Guard force structure of the future will include Armor Brigades and Field Artillery units equipped with the Main Battle Tank (M1 Series), Bradley Fighting Vehicles (M2/M3), Armored Personnel Carriers (M113 Series), Howitzers (M109 Series) and other combat/tracked vehicles. The National Guard units of Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee have and will continue to train and prepare for mobilization at Camp Shelby. The regional location of Camp Shelby is vital to the National Guard to minimize travel time for citizen soldiers from their homes to the Training Site. Camp Shelby fulfills the need for units designated by Forces Command (FORSCOM) and the NGB to mobilize and train there. There are no other training sites available that can meet this regional need.

The NGB does not foresee a change in the overall use of Camp Shelby, only a reconfiguration. The number of troops, vehicles, and training days is not expected to increase. While the number of acres of tracked vehicle maneuver area is proposed to increase, the number of vehicle miles traveled per acre would decrease. The tempo and level of completeness of training events is proposed to increase, as the training exercises become

more realistic, and more comparable to anticipated tactical situations and to the level of training experienced at major FORSCOM installations.

MISUNDERSTANDING #4 - There will be no hunting in the proposed maneuver area.

Previous military use has not precluded hunting in the current tracked vehicle maneuver areas. The proposed action will continue to allow this use. Some hunters believe that military use has positive benefits in providing trails and open areas which both hunters and game species find attractive. It is also important to note that hunting seasons typically occur during periods of low military use.

MISUNDERSTANDING #5 - The proposed action will involve expansion of Camp Shelby from its present configuration.

RESPONSE

There is no proposal to expand Camp Shelby Training Site beyond its current boundary.

For many years, the Camp Shelby Training Site has consisted of approximately 134,000 acres. Of this acreage, approximately 117,000 acres is used under a U.S. Forest Service (USFS) Special Use Permit (SUP). The remainder of the lands are either Federally-owned lands administered by the Department of Defense or State-owned lands. Military training activities occur throughout the Camp Shelby Training Site, including those areas used under the SUP. Conditions of the SUP establish the levels and types of activities that can occur on various tracts of SUP lands. The proposed action is to continue training on the SUP lands and to reconfigure some types of training activities that occur on SUP lands. The reconfiguration would establish new track vehicle training areas primarily in the southeastern portion of the SUP lands, lands already used for military training but not currently permitted for track vehicle activities. The proposed reconfigured military training activities, if allowed under the SUP, will occur on lands currently under permit from the USFS. A very small percentage of lands on which these reconfigured activities will occur are Federally-owned (DoD), State-owned lands, or privately-owned lands already under lease.

Many members of the public appear to recognize the boundaries of Camp Shelby as being limited to the built-up (cantonment) area owned by the State of Mississippi. This area, of about 7,900 acres is located immediately adjacent to Highway 49, and is shown on most highway maps. The much larger permit area, not shown on highway maps, constitutes the majority of Camp Shelby as examined through this EIS.

MISUNDERSTANDING #6 - The Leaf River Wildlife Management Area (LRWMA) is a wildlife refuge.

RESPONSE

The similarity between the terms wildlife management area and wildlife refuge makes this misconception understandable. Some of the confusion may be historical in origin and Mississippi National Guard recognizes that the previous designation may evoke an emotional attachment to LRWMA by some. The Leaf River Development (LRD) Project, the second wildlife restoration project in Mississippi, was officially established by the Mississippi Game and Fish Commission in 1939 through a Memorandum of Understanding with the United States Forest Service. The LRD served as the first large land area (30,000 acres) devoted to game propagation in Mississippi, supplying whitetailed deer and eastern wild turkeys for what became a very successful statewide trap and transfer program. Whitetailed deer were first trapped from LRD for release in other parts of Mississippi in 1946. The last release of deer trapped from the LRWMA took place in Tallahatchie County in 1975.

The Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks currently manages the LRWMA as a public hunting area, not as a game refuge or propagation area. Its designation was changed slightly in 1982 when the Leaf River Game Management Area was renamed the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area. It has been designated as a refuge in the past, and signs designating the refuge remained for some time after it lost that designation in the early 1970s. When it was operated as a refuge, hunting was restricted while the numbers of deer and turkey were being built up during the reintroduction program.

MISUNDERSTANDING #7 - Alternative 3B is the environmentally desirable alternative. It will benefit threatened and endangered species and wildlife in general; is adequate for the battalion task force level training; and is more than adequate for the training needs of Camp Shelby.

RESPONSE

The US Fish and Wildlife Service, prepared two recent (1992 and 1993) Biological Opinions specifically in response to the same set of alternatives presented in the Draft EIS. The Service concluded that of all the proposed alternatives, 3B was the only action alternative that would jeopardize the continued existence of the gopher tortoise even after all possible proposed mitigation efforts had been applied. Should this alternative be selected, they, and the Forest Service, would be in clear violation of the Endangered Species Act. Thus, this is not considered to be reasonable course of action.

The comparison made by many respondents, in which the Draft EIS shows the 23,335 total acres under 3B, and compares this to 39,772 acres under alternative 1, is misleading. While the total acres included within the outer boundaries of the four different Proposed Training Areas (PTA) making up alternative 3B do add to this total, the net acres actually available for maneuver use, after allowing for environmental protection (including T&E species), are only 11,267 acres, and these are divided into numerous small sections separated by sensitive areas. See Figure 3-29, which shows this fragmentation. Especially in PTA 6, which makes up a large proportion of the gross acreage of alternative 3B, only 41% of the gross acreage was available for maneuvering. Following the revised configurations proposed for the FEIS, with environmental restrictions in place, Alternative 3B would provide only a maximum of about 7,500 acres of tracked vehicle maneuver area, compared with about 15,900 acres for alternative 1. Superficially then, while Alternative 3B would seem to impact wildlife and the environment to a lesser degree than the other action alternatives, this does not allow for either the extreme differences in sensitivity or the much lower training usefulness of the area resulting.

In summary, if Alternative 3B were to be fully implemented, it would cause severe, adverse effects to the federally listed gopher tortoise population on Camp Shelby. Such effects are not permitted under the Biological Opinion. Alternative 3B cannot therefore be considered legally or environmentally acceptable, let alone the environmentally desirable alternative.

MISUNDERSTANDING #8 - There should be a change in the overall use of the base as a result of recent changes in global politics.

As announced by the Secretary of Defense in December 1993, the proposed mission of the Army National Guard will focus, in the future, on two roles: a wartime combat mission and a domestic emergency mission. This is in some contrast to the variety of past roles and accompanying force structure, in which the Guard more or less mirrored all active Army functions. In this new organizational structure, the Army Reserve will assume the major responsibility for combat service support missions. Some Army Reserve units whose role is combat arms will transfer to the National Guard, while others will be disestablished as part of the general downsizing of the forces. The Guard is proposed to gain artillery, aviation, mechanized infantry, and armor units, among others. This is in distinct contrast to earlier suggestions that the guard role would focus on support missions and lost its heavy combat arms role.

The Mississippi Army National Guard does not foresee any significant changes in the use of Camp Shelby because of recent changes in global politics. As stated by Michael P. Stone, Secretary of the Army, in the Army 1991 Green Book, "Jubilant over the Warsaw Pact's official demise in April must be tempered by caution in observing the Soviet Union's internal conditions." Recent problems in that area certainly have proven his statement to be true. We face a number of potential threats around the globe, not one primary threat as we did before the breakup of the Warsaw Pact. As the total force is sized down, more reliance is being directed toward the Reserve Components, the National Guard and the Army Reserve, for combat, combat support, and combat service support units. All of these type units train at Camp Shelby now as they have in the past, and the need certainly exists for the future. National Guard combat units play a critical role in the present and future total force national defense strategy which amplifies the need to conduct armor and mechanized infantry training at Camp Shelby. Other than attempting to meet the training needs of a more modern military, no change in the concept of the use of Camp Shelby can be identified.

The National Guard has both a federal and state mission. The federal mission is primary, and that is national defense. The National Guard plays a primary role in the defense of the United States. With future force reductions, the National Guard is predicted to play an even more critical role. This is evidenced by a recent statement in a National Guard Bureau (NGB) Message, Subject: NGB Position Paper Operation BOLD SHIFT, dated 3 January 1992, made by the FORCES COMMAND (FORSCOM) Commander, "The action plan, titled BOLD SHIFT, builds on our insights from the recent Persian Gulf Crisis and exploits the impressive potential of our reserve forces to execute increasingly important roles in the current defense strategy." Time does not allow for the reduction of the military to a point that requires a draft and training of personnel and units to fight a war. It would take well over a year, possibly two years, to start from a draft to deploying a combat ready brigade. With the already important role of the National Guard increasing, it is imperative that effective training be conducted, and adequate training areas and facilities be provided.

The 155th Armor Brigade, Mississippi Army National Guard, is a primary user of Camp Shelby. The 155th Armor Brigade is not scheduled for any future deactivation and is a high

priority unit. The armor brigades of Tennessee and Alabama also use Camp Shelby as their primary annual training site. All three brigades store equipment on a permanent basis at Camp Shelby that is maintained by the Camp Shelby full time force. Other armor units, such as the 108th Armored Cavalry Squadron, also use Camp Shelby as their primary training area and store equipment at Camp Shelby. The number of armor units that use Camp Shelby as their primary training site and mobilization site certainly amplifies the need for this action.

MISUNDERSTANDING #9 - The proposed action will destroy the forest and wildlife dependent upon it. These cannot be replaced. Irreparable damage will be done to the environment and nothing will be left for generations. Lands for hunting and other public use as well as the revenue source for local school systems would also be lost forever.

RESPONSE

Section 2.4.3 of the Final EIS describes the lands comprising the De Soto National Forest as they appeared at the time of acquisition in the 1930s. This description is of an area whose timberlands had been cut over, burned, and frequently left on the public tax rolls until purchased by the federal government. South Mississippi has been described during this period as a sea of grass and stumps which was regularly burned over to control brush and provide grazing for the open range, i.e. no fence laws. Cattle were allowed to range over any land which was not fenced. Much of South Mississippi was in tax default or was owned by large companies and fences were virtually unknown. The land one sees today has been reforested, largely through the stewardship of the U.S. Forest Service and Mississippi Forestry Commission, and supports the important timber industry of today.

There is no loss of acreage to Mississippians nor anyone else. The land will still belong to the people of the United States. There is no proposal to limit access to the lands proposed for tracked vehicle maneuvering. These lands will remain accessible for hunting and other uses.

Under any of the proposed alternatives, should the military need for the land cease, the land can be planted and returned to well stocked timberlands within forty years. These would resemble the 60 year old pine stands of today. Approximately fifteen years after planting, pulpwood size timber may be harvested and revenues generated, 25% of which would be disbursed to the various counties for roads and schools.

The Special Use Permit may be granted for a 10-year period, at which time the need would be re-evaluated as provided for in the Master Agreement between the Secretaries of Agriculture and Defense (Appendix A; Volume 2). Thus when the need no longer exists, the land under permit will return to normal National Forest management.

MISUNDERSTANDING #10 - The Leaf River Wildlife Management Area is a pristine area.

RESPONSE

The majority of misconceptions concerning the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area (LRWMA) focus on its perceived status as a wilderness area, virgin forest, pristine area, natural area, or wildlife refuge. Commentors have stated that the LRWMA should not be impacted by National Guard training activity because of its uniqueness and special qualities. The Mississippi National Guard recognizes the value and special qualities of the LRWMA. These concerns and comments from the public prompted the Mississippi National Guard to initiate a study of the history, management, and use (both past and present) of the LRWMA. This special study of the history of the LRWMA has been added as a separate section (Section 2.4.6) of the Final EIS.

In summary, information gathered on the LRWMA shows that extensive ecological modification has occurred since the mid 1800s, following settlement and natural resource development. The LRWMA cannot be considered either pristine or in a wilderness condition because historical documents show that the region's longleaf pine forests once supported a thriving industry for naval stores and charcoal production and maintained large cattle herds. Furthermore, the remaining virgin longleaf pine forests of South Mississippi were extensively timbered by private interests near the turn of the century and eventually replanted largely as a result of public works programs of the 1930s such as the Civilian Conservation Corps. Presently, the LRWMA is managed cooperatively by the United States Forest Service (USFS) and the Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks for multiple uses, including recreation, wildlife, timber, and military training. USFS actions in the LRWMA are typical of management of other units of the De Soto National Forest. The age and composition of forests in the LRWMA are very similar to those of the Black Creek Ranger District as a whole. Therefore, no areas resembling the original longleaf pine community exist today at LRWMA and the area is ecologically similar to adjacent areas of the De Soto National Forest. However, the casual observer may view the area as "pristine" because of the large amount of mature timber observed from the roads in the LRWMA.

MISUNDERSTANDING #11 - The De Soto National Forest is a pristine longleaf pine ecosystem and forest.

RESPONSE

As discussed in Section 2.4.3, the present day De Soto National Forest timberlands originated in the 1930's following the railroad logging from 1900-1930. Very few stands of trees are older than 75 years of age, although approximately 60% of the Forest is from 60 to 70 years of age. These stands may present a pristine, old-growth appearance by their continuity and the presence of dead snags, down timber, and frequent holes in the canopy occupied by younger trees.

Since the original truly pristine ecosystem was destroyed earlier in this century, the present long-leaf pine ecosystem is a result of managed secondary succession. The present system has gone through successional stages from an open grassland through a combination of managed natural and Civilian Conservation Corps planted longleaf and slash pine plantations. These plantations in turn have taken on the appearance of natural stands as they increased in age and received intermediate thinning cuts to promote growth.

Thus the De Soto National Forest is a dynamic, managed combination of ecosystems. The longleaf pine ecosystem is just one of several managed ecosystems on the Forest.

MISUNDERSTANDING #12 - The proposed action involves swapping or exchanging of land between the Department of Army and the US Forest Service or the acquisition of title by the Mississippi Army National Guard of 116,000 acres of De Soto National Forest.

RESPONSE

The issue of land transfer or land exchange has been raised many times by the public. During the acquisition of lands for the Army's Piñon Canyon Maneuver Site (PCMS), near Trinidad, Colorado, approximately 16,000 acres of lands outside the planned maneuver areas were required by regulation to be acquired from land owners who also had lands acquired within the maneuver areas. These lands, which contained historic, archeological, and paleontological sites, were originally proposed to be transferred to the National Forest System in exchange for transfer of ownership of a portion of Camp Shelby which lies within the De Soto National Forest. The Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS for such an action was published in the *Federal Register* on 4 Jan 90, and public scoping meetings were held at three locations in Mississippi in January 1990 (U.S. Govt. Printing Office, *Federal Register*, Vol. 55, No. 3, p. 351, 4 January 1991).

At least five potential variations were suggested at that time for examination as alternatives. Several of the alternatives suggested that the 16,000 acres of the PCMS be exchanged for 32,000 acres now within the southeast portion of the Camp Shelby Special Use Permit Area.

The original scope of this EIS included the issue of the proposed land interchange between the Department of the Army and the USFS concerning Piñon Canyon, Colorado lands. However, this is no longer an issue being studied in this EIS. The Piñon Canyon lands were transferred directly to the National Forest System through Congressional action in fiscal year 1991. The Colorado land transfer is no longer connected to any proposed land interchanges. No National Forests lands are being considered for interchange in this EIS.

In addition, there is no proposal to acquire title to the approximately 117,000 acres of National Forest lands currently used under a SUP. The Department of Army is proposing, under a new SUP, to continue use of these lands and to reconfigure training areas to provide for track vehicle maneuver training in the southeastern portion of the SUP lands. The USFS will continue to be responsible for administration of any lands for which an SUP is issued and to oversee use and rehabilitation of this lands within the terms and clauses of the SUP.

MISUNDERSTANDING #13 - There will be live firing of weapons in the proposed tracked vehicle maneuver area.

RESPONSE

Live fire is restricted to ranges dedicated to that purpose. There is no proposal for live firing of any weapons in the proposed tracked vehicle maneuver area. No changes are proposed in the locations of any weapons firing except for the range construction discussed in Sections 1.1.5 and 1.3 of the Final EIS. The use of blanks, pyrotechnics and Multi-Integrated Laser Engagement Systems (MILES) will continue to be used as is currently used in all training areas. The training to be conducted in the proposed maneuver areas is described in Sections 1.2.7, 2.1.1, and Appendix C of the Final EIS. These will produce some noise, but no projectiles are fired.

MISUNDERSTANDING #14 - The Leaf River Wildlife Management Area will be ruined if the proposed action is implemented.

RESPONSE

The proposed training will not ruin the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area (LRWMA). Varied training activities have been occurring in the De Soto National Forest at Camp Shelby since the 1940s, and field training has taken place at various times since WW I. While these activities have modified the ecological community of Camp Shelby to some extent they have not ruined those sections of the forest supporting seasonal training use. Special Use Permits (SUP) issued by the United States Forest Service specify that activities are located and carried out to minimize environmental disruption while allowing other uses of the National Forest. Moreover, the ecological community of the LRWMA is not distinctly different from other portions of the Black Creek Ranger District and should respond to these modifications in a similar fashion.

MISUNDERSTANDING #15 - The Black Creek Wilderness is a natural wilderness area that will be destroyed or greatly affected if the proposed action is implemented.

RESPONSE

The Black Creek Wilderness is located four miles west of any area designated for training or special use and is not part of any proposed action by Mississippi National Guard. The Black Creek Wilderness consists of mixed stands of bottomland hardwoods and loblolly and longleaf pine. It is not being managed by United States Forest Service (USFS) for timber production but for recreational and wilderness values. This area was timbered, grazed and farmed like much of the rest of South Mississippi and retains no original "natural" wilderness (virgin longleaf pine or hardwoods).

MISUNDERSTANDING #16 - The proposed battalion task force level armor training should be done in the west or southwest "...in the desert which is a wasteland and would incur less environmental damage than if the training were done in the Southeastern Mississippi."

RESPONSE

The scientific community now recognizes that, in spite of presenting a barren appearance, the arid areas of the Western United States are more fragile in an ecological sense of the word than are the eastern portions of the country where rainfall is more abundant. Higher rainfall amounts usually equate to denser vegetation and more rapid recovery of that vegetation when it is damaged. This, in turn, affords more protection to the soil from the erosive forces of wind and water. Soils in arid areas are far more prone to erosion, even with lower rainfall, due to their having much less vegetation cover, higher inherent erodibility, and high alkalinity levels. Soils in arid areas that are stripped of their vegetative cover can take many decades to recover. In contrast, much of the De Soto National Forest has shown rapid recovery from the severe damage caused by clear cutting which took place prior to 1940.

The more sparse vegetation in arid areas does not necessarily imply low species diversity. White Sands Missile Range, located in the Chihuahuan Desert in south-central New Mexico, harbors almost 1,000 species of plants, and hundreds of species of mammals, birds, and reptiles, including rare and endangered species. However, number of species and productivity per unit area is usually lower in arid areas.

The common misconception that desert ecosystems are not as ecologically or economically important as eastern forested ecosystems is inaccurate. Although temperate environments generally have greater human economic value (for example, agricultural value) on a per acre basis, it is difficult to place a dollar value on ecological importance whether it be an acre of desert or forest. The importance of any ecosystem is measured by how well it functions and no ecosystem can be disturbed (i.e. by tactical vehicles) without the potential of negative results. Although there are some physical attributes of arid environments that make them more amenable to military maneuver training the consequences must be weighed carefully and mitigated, just as they should be in the southern mixed forests of southeastern Mississippi.

The present human uses of these western lands, including recreation, and their ecological integrity would be more adversely affected than they now are. Further, many of the western lands have a history of extensive, well-preserved archeological and other cultural resource sites, whose preservation has been a continuing concern in areas which have been used for tracked vehicle maneuver. In summary, transferring mechanized training from southeastern Mississippi to the installations in the west or southwest where tracked vehicle training is now allowed would not be risk free.

MISUNDERSTANDING #17 - Everything in the proposed tracked vehicle maneuver area will be destroyed if the proposed action is implemented.

RESPONSE

During the planning stages of this project, proposed tracked vehicle training areas were defined, this outer boundary simply enclosed an area within which tracked vehicle maneuver areas were to be identified. The acreage reported as the gross acres in the Draft EIS represents all land area within this outer border. A closer examination of the data presented in the Final EIS (Table 1-3) will show that an average of less than 50% (closer to 40% under most alternatives) of this area will be either cleared or thinned to be made available for tracked vehicle maneuver. A majority of the forested area in each Proposed Training Area (PTA) is proposed to be left undisturbed, and would not be used for tracked vehicle maneuver.

The revised land development alternatives described in the Final EIS have somewhat different numeric values, but the principle that a majority of the land area within the PTA boundary will remain unmodified is unchanged (FEIS - Section 1.2.1.6).

MISUNDERSTANDING #18 - The impact area is a nearly pristine area.

RESPONSE

The artillery impact area encompasses approximately 4,600 acres (FEIS Fig 2-1, Section 2.1.2.1). While it is undisturbed in the sense that safety considerations allow only infrequent human entry, it is a specialized land use which is managed for its purpose -- the safe practice of artillery and tank gunnery for purposes of military preparedness. It has been in use for this purpose for more than 50 years and may be considered dedicated solely to this use. Many of the weapons which have been used in the area produce duds: the popular term for the small proportion of high-explosive projectiles which do not explode upon impact and remain dangerous for many years. The danger from unexploded rounds is considered high. For this reason, among others, no timber harvest has taken place, no hunting is allowed, and, in fact, some wildlife species tolerant of the noise of weapons firing have prospered. While the vegetation is primarily of scattered small trees rather than mature forest, the area does have certain values which are above average, but it is more properly considered a disturbed area with a very specialized function. We also note that the tank safety fan is not synonymous with the impact area. There is a buffer zone surrounding the impact area in which most of the firing ranges are sited. It is considered unmanaged by the Forest Service, which conducts no subsurface activities within this zone. A description of the relationship between the two areas is found in Sections 2.1.2.1 and 2.1.2.2 of the FEIS.

MISUNDERSTANDING #19 - There currently is no tracked vehicle maneuver training south of the Eight Mile Road (FS 303).

RESPONSE

Within the Camp Shelby Special Use Permit (SUP) area, immediately south of Forest Service Road 303, are three training areas, T-47, T-49, and T-54, where a variety of military training activities, including tracked vehicle maneuvers, occur. Many of the training activities include accomplishment of various Army Training and Evaluation Program (ARTEP) tasks. The ARTEP tells the commander how to duplicate the conditions of the battlefield. It defines for each commander, both Active Army and Reserve, the tasks which his unit must perform in combat. It also indicates the conditions under which his units must accomplish those tasks and the standards which his units must meet to insure combat readiness. The purpose of the ARTEP is to find out how well a battalion force can perform specific missions under simulated battle conditions.

Typical uses of these and other training areas and the number of days these areas were assigned for use in training years 1987 and 1988 are found in Section 2.1.1.2. of the Environmental Impact Statement. These areas, which were assigned for training between 27 and 62 days each year in 1987 and 1988, are used for the following types of training:

- Bivouac and small unit training
- Convoy training
- Aviation training
- Nuclear, Biological and Chemical training
- Patrolling
- Infantry ARTEP training
- Engineer ARTEP training
- Track vehicle maneuver and ARTEP training
- Special Operations

Military training activities also occur on SUP lands other than the tracked vehicle training areas. South of these tracked vehicle maneuver areas, training activities such as wheeled vehicle convoy training, combat service support training, military police training, aviation training, special operations, and infantry training take place. No records are currently kept on the frequency of usage of this area.

MISUNDERSTANDING #20 - Non eye-safe target acquisition lasers will be used in the proposed tracked vehicle maneuver areas.

RESPONSE

The Multi-Integrated Laser Engagement Systems (MILES) used is eye safe and non-injurious and is used by and against personnel as well as vehicles. The only laser system that is not eye safe are the Target Acquisition Lasers used in live fire tank gunnery. Use of this laser without filter, therefore, is restricted to the current tank firing ranges at Camp Shelby. Before it is placed in operation, safety barricades are put in place and all personnel are removed from the gunnery safety fan areas. When this system is used in training areas, an eye-safe filter system is engaged and the system becomes eye safe and non-injurious.

MISUNDERSTANDING #21 - There will be significant additional noise as a result of implementing the new tracked vehicle maneuver areas.

RESPONSE

Some commentators appear to have understood that the maneuvers proposed to take place in the newly-developed areas will involve weapons firing. This is not correct. Under all alternatives, live fire will continue to be restricted to the existing impact area, and will be conducted from present or proposed ranges or firing points. Weapons related noise will thus be unchanged from the present. Certain field training, especially during the summer Annual Training periods, involve noisemaking devices intended to simulate weapons firing. Some smaller changes in distribution of noise, especially vehicle noise, will take place as new maneuver areas are used. Some persons living very close to the new areas will experience slightly increased levels of noise. This is examined in the Final EIS, in Section 3.3.5.

MISUNDERSTANDING #22 - The primary goals of the National Forests are to protect forest land for the use and enjoyment of the public, and it is set aside for wilderness, wildlife, and recreation use.

RESPONSE

The original authority for the creation of Forest Reserves (National Forests) from the public lands was in the Creative Act of 1891. This created Forest Reserves as public reservations. The Organic Act of 1897 provided for control and administration of these and future National Forests "to improve and protect the forest within the boundaries, or for the purpose of securing favorable conditions of water flows, and to furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of the citizens of the United States".

The Weeks law of 1911 authorized the purchase of lands for National Forests as "may be necessary to the regulation of the flow of navigable streams or for the production of timber". This resulted in the creation of most of the National Forests in the East.

The Multiple-Use Sustained Yield (MUSY) Act of 1960 put into law the principles under which the National Forests had been managed for over 50 years. It stated that "the National Forests are established and shall be administered for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish purposes". It declared the purposes of the Act to be supplemental to the purposes for which the National Forests were established under the Organic Act. The Act also recognized the establishment and management of wilderness areas as being consistent with the purposes of the Act.

The National Forest Management Act of 1976 recognized "the fundamental need to protect and where appropriate, improve the quality of soil, water, and air resources". It also provided the framework for land management planning for individual units of the National Forest System. These plans were to provide for multiple use and sustained yield of the products and services in accordance with the MUSY Act including coordination of outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, wildlife and fish, and wilderness.

Watershed protection and timber management have thus been the purpose for the creation of past National Forests and remain two of the resources for which the land is managed. The others being outdoor recreation, range, wildlife and fish, wilderness, soil, water, and air. The National Forests were not set aside for recreation purposes but are managed to provide a wide array of goods and services to the people of the United States.

Included with these goods and services are provisions for special uses of National Forest lands by individuals, corporations, government entities, and various branches of the armed services. Terms of these special uses are included in a special use permit. Some examples of permitted uses are driveways, utility rights-of-way, snow ski areas, public road easements, and various types of military facilities and uses throughout the United States.

MISUNDERSTANDING #23 - The proposed action will result in the takeover of the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area by the Mississippi National Guard.

RESPONSE:

The Leaf River Wildlife Management Area (LRWMA) is presently managed as a public hunting area by the Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks under a Memorandum of Understanding with the U.S. Forest Service. Most of the LRWMA is within the boundary of the present military Special Use Permit for Camp Shelby, and no change is proposed to this arrangement under any alternative. It is acknowledged that, under Alternatives 1 and 2, about 28 percent of the LRWMA would be altered over a period of 4 to 5 years by timber clearing and thinning for the proposed actions. Data from the Forest Service indicate that about 2.5% of the area is now cleared or thinned, and replanted, each year. Thus, present management activities will disturb, to some degree, 10% to 12% of the area over a 4 to 5 year period. While this change is acknowledged to be measurable, it should not be compared to an untouched area in which no human actions ever take place. The proposed modification and use of the LRWMA does not constitute a takeover.

MISUNDERSTANDING #24 - The Special Use permit Area is almost the entire De Soto National Forest.

RESPONSE

The De Soto National Forest covers approximately 500,000 acres and is administered as three Ranger Districts. The Black Creek Ranger District administers approximately 240,000 acres, including the approximately 117,000 acre Camp Shelby Special Use Permit.

MISUNDERSTANDING #25 - The proposed action will result in significantly increased troop numbers and higher levels of training activity, thus resulting in significantly increased economic benefits to the area.

RESPONSE

This EIS examines, as one of many topics, the economic effects of the proposed actions, but economic effects are not considered a primary basis for the final choice of alternative. None of the proposed alternatives involve training greater numbers of personnel at Camp Shelby or employing measurably more personnel at the site. Current activities consist of weekend training, on about 20 weekends a year, for 600 to 5,000 troops. Additional intensive training takes place during the summer months and involves 6,000 to 8,000 troops at one time for five two week periods. Under Alternatives 1, 2, 3A, 3B, and 4, proposed training, in terms of numbers of troops and personnel, would continue at approximately the same level as current training (Section 1.2.8).

The only economic benefit proposed to be realized by implementing the preferred action would be in comparison to the No Action alternative. The No Action alternative would involve closing Camp Shelby and the cessation of training activities. Camp Shelby, in 1990, employed 691 full-time permanent (480 military and 211 civilian) people. These jobs accounted for 6.6% of the total government (local, state, federal) jobs in the area. Refer to the results of the Economic Impact Forecast Model (Appendix M, Section A), Section 3.1.3.2 of the Final EIS.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Comment Letter, Comment Form, or Public Hearing Statement

Responses to Comments

ABC, Inc.
P.O. Box xxxxxx
Jackson, Mississippi xxxxx-xxxx

Dear Mr. XXXXXXX:

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Comment 1:1
 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Comment 1: 2:1

Comment 1.3: Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Ммммм Нннннннн

NOTE: While most responses are found on the same page as the comments, in some cases the responses are found on an adjacent page, as noted in *italics*.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
ABC, Inc.

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks (John Burris)



Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks
Jack Herring, Executive Director

February 28, 1992

Mobile District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
CESAM-PD-EI
ATTN: Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001

Dear Sir:

I would like to take this opportunity to offer some comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement: Military Training Use of National Forest Lands Camp Shelby, Mississippi (DEIS). These comments represent the collaboration of several members of my staff. I think that the Military Department is to be congratulated on their efforts to avoid wetlands and minimize the impacts of soil erosion. The Department is also to be commended for the effort given to environmental education of units training on Camp Shelby. We support the continued use and further development of the Integrated Training Area Management Program (ITAMP) which includes the Land Condition Trend Analysis (LCTA). Overall, this draft is a much improved version of earlier drafts.

Our comments centered on two areas. One, what ecological impacts were expected and how were they addressed in the DEIS? Second, what information is available to determine impacts to the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area (LRWMA) and what management strategies would be available to us?

The first comments are page specific and address the ecological questions.

Page ES-11

The potential impact on the red-cockaded woodpecker and gopher tortoise of Alternatives 1-4 is sufficiently different from currently permitted activities that a new biological opinion should be sought. Tables ES-2 and ES-3 indicate short- and long-term benefit to threatened and endangered species as a consequence of Alternatives 1-4; a conclusion that is not supported by the facts, particularly with respect to the red-cockaded woodpecker. Without additional assessments regarding the contribution of military activities to recovery, the conclusion that threatened and endangered species will benefit ("+") as a result of implementing all alternatives is biologically unsubstantiated.

1:1 Comment noted.

1:2 The U.S. Forest Service is in the process of completing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the management of the red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) on National Forest administered lands. A biological opinion will accompany this document.

All alternatives in the Camp Shelby EIS meet the guidelines set forth by the U.S. Forest Service Interim Guidelines for Management of the RCW which will remain in effect until the Final EIS (FEIS) for the management of the RCW is completed and the Regional Forester signs a Record of Decision. Should the selected alternative result in activity not covered in the RCW FEIS, consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will occur.

Biological opinions have been sought and received by both the National Guard Bureau and the U.S. Forest Service on the potential for effects on the gopher tortoise of the proposed actions, including all alternatives (see Appendix L). See revised Tables 4-1 and 4-2 for present statement of anticipated effects.

1:1

1:2

Although it is obvious that great care has been taken to avoid destruction of red-cockaded woodpecker cavity trees and to minimize usurpation of tortoise habitat, creation of extensive new training areas and 400m wide movement corridors between them will result in the permanent "take" of upland habitats potentially suitable for recolonization by both species, thus reducing potential recovery levels. The loss of up to 10,000 acres of Longleaf Pine forest is significant.

Thousands of acres of upland soils will be denuded of potential cavity trees, just as many of the trees are on the threshold of attaining ages suitable for development of cavities. Likewise, it is unlikely that tortoises will be able to colonize uplands utilized for heavy vehicular traffic. Genuine recruitment (population growth from surviving young) is not likely under the current proposed activities.

In effect, a barrier approximately 20 miles long will be created that will greatly restrict east-west movements of tortoises in the heart of their Mississippi range. This will not only lower potential population levels, but will isolate extant colonies and exacerbate the problems associated with fragmentation: increased likelihood of local extinctions and inbreeding depression.

Page L-1-8, paragraph 5, details the paramount importance of the Federal role in tortoise recovery, and although cited within the EIS, its spirit seems to have been largely ignored. "The prospects for gopher tortoise survival and recovery rest to a large extent with the NGB/MSARNG and USFS because they have statutory obligations under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Accordingly, through the consultation process, it has been a Service aim to effect a long term reversal in gopher tortoise declines through productive changes in land management activities where remaining gopher tortoise colonies exist. The Federal role in this endangered species issue is elevated in importance because most gopher tortoises occur on lands owned by forest industry and private individuals where prevailing timber management practices have been and may remain incompatible with habitat requirements of the gopher tortoise, resulting in a continued decline of gopher tortoise populations."

page 1-2 para. 3
...shale based valley... There are no reported extensive shale formations in this part of Mississippi. See page 2-16 section 2.3.3.1.

pages 1-19 through 1-23.
NEPA requires that reasonable and practicable alternatives be considered for a proposed action. As configured, the alternatives presented do not appear reasonable with regard to military mission and intent. As in Alternative 2, "it does not meet necessary training requirements" (page 1-32, para. 6). As

2

1:3

1:3 Gopher tortoise habitat occurs throughout the De Soto National Forest. The US Fish & Wildlife Service Recovery Plan for the gopher tortoise defines recovery as five gopher tortoise per hectare of priority soils, defined as deep sands over 1.5 meters (about 9.5 feet). There's an estimated 12-18,000 acres of priority soils (Eustis-Troup Soil Series) on the De Soto with an estimated 5300 acres scattered throughout the Camp Shelby permit area. Gopher tortoise colony sites and the priority soils are avoided in all alternatives. The clearing of some 10,000 acres of longleaf pine forest on non-priority soils should not affect the recovery of the species.

It is estimated that on the De Soto National Forest there is over 170,000 acres of pine which is approximately 60 years old. There are no known existing active RCW colonies (Appendix N) in the Camp Shelby permit area. Therefore the potential loss of approximately 10,000 acres of 60 year old longleaf pine containing no active or inactive colonies should not prevent attaining a recovery population on the De Soto National Forest.

1:4

See responses to comments 1:2 and 1:10 for additional information.

1:4 The US Fish & Wildlife Service's Biological Opinions (September 1992 and October 1993) state that implementation of any of the action alternatives, with the exception of 3B, would not result in direct adverse impacts to the gopher tortoise. In addition, they conclude that indirect and cumulative effects of current military activities and the proposed alternatives (except 3B) are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the gopher tortoise. These conclusions were based in part on available data regarding impacts to gopher tortoise movements, habitat fragmentation, and inbreeding depression. The assertion that genuine recruitment has not occurred, or that a barrier greatly restricting east-west movements by gopher tortoises would be created by current and proposed activities is not mentioned nor expected based on information presented in the recent Biological Opinion (BO) or in the Biological Assessment (BA). To the contrary, both the BO and BA state that open areas created by the proposed training areas and travel corridors would be attractive to the gopher tortoise because of the resulting herbaceous ground cover, and may in fact aid the gopher tortoise in dispersing to presently unoccupied areas.

1:5

See response to comment 1:3 for additional discussion.

1:5 All training area, travel corridor, and facility boundaries proposed in the DEIS (and subsequent revisions for the FEIS) were developed specifically to avoid gopher tortoise colonies, burrows, and priority soils -- whether or not they are occupied -- to the greatest degree possible (see also Misconception 1, Vol III of the Final EIS). In addition, the establishment and preservation of T-44 as a long-term gopher tortoise refuge will provide a unique opportunity for cooperative research into questions concerning the gopher tortoise, and can be viewed as exemplifying the spirit of the federal commitment to the preservation and enhancement of the gopher tortoise.

1:6

1:7

In response to recommendations that more basic research knowledge be made available, a formal research program to investigate population dynamics, including recruitment and migration, has been implemented as of September 1993. The field studies will be conducted under the direction of the Mississippi Natural Heritage Program, an affiliate of the Nature Conservancy.

1:6 Text has been revised.

1:7 The proposed actions examined are not the different potential locations for a brigade-level training area, but of alternative levels of training activity at locations suitable for that activity. This is stated in Section 1.1, page 1-1, of both the Draft and Final EIS, as follows: "The EIS will disclose and evaluate the environmental impacts associated with various levels of military training activity on National Forest

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks (John Burris)

in Alternative 3A, "it would not meet the full combat readiness requirement" (page 1-35, para. 4). As in Alternative 3B, "it cannot meet full requirements for training opposing battalions" (page 1-37, para. 1). In Alternative 4, "troops training at Camp Shelby would not receive fully adequate training to permit them to sustain combat readiness" (page 1-37, para. 3). Alternative 6 would require the closure of Camp Shelby. Only alternatives that would have allowed battalion level training at Camp Shelby are truly acceptable, the others are only "straw-men" set up as false alternatives to demonstrate the superiority of the selected alternative.

The DEIS could have presented reasonable choices by examining environmental and other effects among alternative site configurations which would allow battalion level training. As presented, only one site was selected for each alternative. These are not true "alternative training areas". Instead, the site selected is fixed for each alternative level of military activity. For comparison, the Training Facilities EIS considered the implementation of facilities at alternative sites at Camp Shelby. Were there reasons why alternative sites could not have been evaluated in this DEIS?

Pages 1-27, 3-18
Conclusions that the creation of forested islands will enhance biodiversity is a distortion of the meaning of the term. As currently accepted, "biodiversity" is not a synonym for local species richness (the meaning apparently accepted by the EIS). Rather, the term refers to the full complement of species at regional, national, or global scales in the proportion expected under natural conditions. Increasing levels of edge and early-successional species does nothing to preserve biological diversity on the larger landscape. Few ecologists would state that creation of large permanent openings in a longleaf pine forest would increase "biodiversity".

The conversion of longleaf/slash forests to non-forest habitat (as well as to mostly hardwood forest in the "islands") for military training will have a negative effect on the above mentioned features of biological diversity. While forest clearing will favor species which respond to disturbance and early successional environments, these taxa presently have and will continue to have suitable habitat on the DeSoto National Forest. The net effect of forest clearing will be negative for species diversity of the longleaf pine forest, as well as to the longleaf community itself. Less than 4% of the original longleaf pine forest ecosystem exists today, and Forest Service Inventory Analysis indicates the decline in acreage will continue. By some accounts, the longleaf pine forest is endangered.

While forested islands are preferable to the alternative of none, there is no analysis or biological basis in the draft EIS to

lands. ... The SUP will establish the levels and types of military training activities permitted on National Forest lands. The Department of the Army will utilize this EIS to verify in the Record Of Decision (ROD) its selected alternative and commitment of manpower and resources to support operations and training activities at Camp Shelby, Mississippi as it relates to proposed activities within the framework of the Special Use Permit."

We believe that the several levels of training activity do represent an adequate range of alternatives.

1:8 Please see the response to Comment 1:7.

1:9 The use of forested islands is not a part of the proposal within the Final EIS (see section 1.2.1.3.1).

We agree that differing definitions of biological diversity were used in development of the Draft EIS. A group of scientists representing the Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Natural Heritage Program, the proponents of the action, and the document preparers has met and agreed to a common definition for biodiversity to be used throughout the FEIS (section 1.2.1.4.3). In response to the committee recommendations, the importance of edge in maintaining local and regional biodiversity (as defined by the committee), in addition to other factors influencing biodiversity, has been re-examined, and is reflected in the discussions presented in section 3.1.2.6. In addition, an entirely new section has been added to each chapter of the FEIS in order to focus specifically on biodiversity related issues.

1:10 Please see the additional coverage of the effects of forest clearing on biodiversity added to the FEIS in Section 3.3.2.6.

The longleaf pine forest on the De Soto National Forest (DNF) is a managed ecosystem. As such, it contains multiple stands of 10 to several hundred acres of varying ages. Approximately 50% of the acreage is in stands 55 years and older. The acreages to be cleared in any of the alternatives are not solid blocks of 60 year old longleaf (see Tables 3-31, 3-33, 3-35, and 3-37), but multiple stands reflecting the age classes found throughout the DNF.

The 1990 Forest Survey estimated that there were 234,600 acres of longleaf pine forest type in Mississippi. In 1992 Forest Service estimates were that 201,000 acres occurred on the DNF. The acreage of longleaf on the DNF has increased approximately 8,000 acres since the Forest began stressing longleaf pine management in the mid 1970s. This increase is a result of replanting harvested stands of slash and loblolly pines to longleaf when the sites were suited for growing longleaf.

1:11 See additional coverage in Section 3.3.2.6 and 3.5.1.

We agree that the forested island concept is not equal to no action with respect to maintenance of biodiversity, and no claim was made for this. What was hypothesized was that it was a superior approach to uniform thinning. We note that virtually no forested islands are proposed within any alternative in the Final EIS. Continuous corridors of habitat have been developed as an alternative to islands. Please see also the response to Comments 1:9 and 1:10.

1:11	conclude that they will function to maintain biological diversity as that which presently exists in the area or that they will function beyond the short-term as "micro-refuges" (page 3-131, para. 3).
1:12	Page 2-31, para. 4 In alternative 1, training areas and movement corridors include 1,323 acres of priority soils, and include or pass through 24 tortoise colonies. The contractor for the tortoise biological assessment has strongly recommended that colonies and priority soils in training areas be demarcated and protected and that corridors be repositioned to avoid colonies and priority soils. It is noted that gopher tortoise colonies are addressed in Section 3.3.1 (page 3-95) but that priority soils are still not addressed in the EIS. It should be noted further that these areas will be habitat islands, with a higher edge to interior ratio, and will not function as nor be characterized by the same community suite as identically sized and positioned areas in contiguous habitat.
1:13	Page 2-21, para. 3 <i>Regina rigida</i> , not <i>Regina regida</i> <i>Sceloporus undulatus</i> , not <i>Sceloporus undulatus</i> <i>Trachemys scripta elegans</i> , not <i>Chrysemys scripta elegans</i> <i>Pseudemys</i> spp., not <i>Chrysemys</i> spp.
1:14	Page 2-22, para. 4 Yellow Jessamine is a vine not a shrub. The first sentence of this paragraph is confusing and adds nothing to understanding of the understory. This sentence should be re-written to introduce the remaining sentences of the paragraph.
1:15	Page 2-23, para. 3 <i>Sarracenia leucophylla</i> does not occur on Camp Shelby and, in fact, is not known to be extant west of the Pascagoula River.
1:16	Page 2-23, para. 4 <i>Nyssa ogeche</i> is not known to occur in Mississippi. The Swamp Tupelo is either <i>Nyssa aquatica</i> or <i>Nyssa sylvatica biflora</i> .
1:17	Page 2-26, para. 5 The proper citation is: The Mississippi Museum of Natural Science, not Natural History.
1:18	Page 2-29, para. 3 The black bear, southern hognose snake and Bewick's Wren are listed as endangered (not sensitive) by the State of Mississippi. The Louisiana black bear (<i>Ursus americanus luteolus</i>) has been recently listed by USFWS as threatened and its historic range includes the Camp Shelby area. The proper citation is: The Mississippi Natural Heritage Program instead of Museum.

1:12 With only a few small exceptions, the revised training area development proposals associated with the Final EIS avoid all verified priority soils and all tortoise colonies, in compliance with the Biological Opinions issued in September 1992 and September 1993 (Appendix L). See also Sections 1.4.2 and 3.4.8 of the FEIS.

The boundaries for the alternatives described in the DEIS have been adjusted in response to more current data concerning gopher tortoise distribution. In Alternative 1, there are now approximately 1900 acres of gopher tortoise priority soils. Of this total, only 51 acres may be modified (timber removal) while the remaining 1850 acres will not be affected. No tracked vehicle maneuvering will be occurring on priority soils, which will continue to be managed as recommended in the gopher tortoise recovery plan. Those 51 acres of priority soils potentially affected are not occupied by colonies or isolated individuals at the present time, and primarily occur adjacent to existing roads and/or wetland crossings. Boundaries in each of the other action alternatives have also been adjusted to accommodate the gopher tortoise and avoid priority soils. See also the response to comment 1:3.

As discussed in the responses to comments 1:9 and 1:11, above, the forested island concept described in the DEIS is no longer being considered. In the FEIS, an effort has been made to link together stands of timber rather than to create isolated islands. These contiguous stands will frequently be associated with riparian corridors and/or priority soils, and will therefore more closely resemble a dendritic pattern rather than a mosaic of islands.

1:13 The corrections suggested have been incorporated.

1:14 Yellow jessamine, *Gelsemium sempervirens* is in fact a trailing or climbing woody vine and not a shrub as mistakenly indicated in the DEIS section 2.4.1 third paragraph. The opening sentence of this paragraph has been edited to clearly introduce the content of the paragraph. Many reference books typically include woody vines in the same category as shrubs (as opposed to trees). This listing of convenience has caused unnecessary confusion here, which is regretted.

1:15 The recently completed floristic inventory of Camp Shelby as part of the Land Condition Trend Analysis (LCTA) program, has not located *Sarracenia leucophylla* on Camp Shelby. The reference has been corrected in the FEIS.

1:16 Again, the LCTA floristic inventory did not identify *Nyssa ogeche* as occurring on Camp Shelby and the reference has been removed from the FEIS.

1:17 Text has been corrected.

1:18 The corrections in the discussion of state-listed species have been made. The Louisiana black bear is discussed in Section 2.4.5.1.2. The correction to the citation has been made throughout.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks (John Burris)

Page 2-30, para 3 The red wolf is presumed extinct in the wild.	1:19	1:19 Comment noted.
Page 2-31, para 5 USACERL and Camp Shelby are to be commended for initiating the Fitzpatrick survey for this endemic species.	1:20	1:20 Comment noted.
Page 2-33, para 2 Bluenose shiner should be moved down one line to the next paragraph.	1:21	1:21 This editorial change has been made.
Page 2-33, para. 5 The rainbow snake and southern hognose are listed by the State of Mississippi as endangered species. The diamondback terrapin and gulf salt marsh snake are salt marsh species and do not occur on Camp Shelby, and probably do not even occur on Desoto National Forest lands (certainly not on the Black Creek District). The dusky gopher frog is proposed for listing by the USFWS in the near future. The lavender burrowing crayfish is not known to occur on Camp Shelby. Its earlier report as present on Camp Shelby arose from the fact that the first collections of the Camp Shelby burrowing crayfish were tentatively identified as <i>Fallicambarus byseri</i> .	1:22	1:22 The corrections to our previous information on the presence of these species is appreciated. 1:23 See response to comment 1:22. The revised information has been incorporated into the Final EIS where appropriate. 1:24 Comment noted. 1:25 Please see the response to Comment 1:12.
Page 2-33, para. 6, and following All 25 listed plants are listed by the Mississippi Natural Heritage Program (not Natural Heritage Agency). The designation of a species as sensitive has a formal meaning to the U.S. Forest Service and its use in this context in this EIS may be confusing to some readers. The classification of plants as rare or special concern is no longer done by the Natural Heritage Program (Global and State ranks are now used instead). <i>Rhapidophyllum hystrix</i> and <i>Ilex myrtifolia</i> are listed here as special concern plants and on the previous page as rare plants. A complete listing of special plants (species which are on the Natural Heritage Program list) is attached. There have been several changes since data was first requested from the Natural Heritage Program.	1:23	
Page 3-20, para 2 The fact that the Camp Shelby crayfish has not been documented in other areas of the country or state does not suggest that military activities on Camp Shelby have not seriously threatened this crayfishes existence. It is very likely that this crayfish was always a very narrow endemic and it may never have had a distribution any larger than it is now. Its continued existence on Camp Shelby argues that it can tolerate present disturbances but that is not the same as the comment made in the DEIS.	1:24	
Page 3-26, para. 3 Although ITAM addresses mitigation regarding soils, the impact on priority soils (for gopher tortoise management) is still a major concern. According to the Biological Assessment (p. 29), 1700 of	1:25	

the 1800 acres of priority soils on Camp Shelby are located within the proposed maneuver areas. It is obvious that activities on this large a percentage of the priority soils will have a major impact on gopher tortoise recovery on Camp Shelby.	1:25	1:26	Comment noted. See also the response to Comments 1:9, 1:11 and 1:12.
Page 3-71, para. 1 "Concealment island" is not equivalent to "wildlife habitat". The use of forest islands in military exercises will reduce or negate the value to wildlife.	1:25	1:26	The suggested correction has been made.
Page 3-76, para. 3. The correct term is: Heritage Program, not Agency.	1:27	1:27	The terminology and species included in the discussion have been revised (see Sections 2.4.5.1 and 2.4.5.2 for the revised treatment). The citation has been corrected.
Page 3-76, para. 3 Stewartia malacodendron is not a federal candidate species. However Xyris scabrifolia, Lachnocaulon digynum, Aristida simpliciflora, and Agrimonia incisa are all federal candidate species. Cite as Mississippi Natural Heritage Program not Heritage Agency.	1:28	1:28	Please refer to the responses to comments 1:3, 1:9, 1:10 and 1:11.
Page 3-81, para. 1 As discussed elsewhere in these comments, creating more edge habitat within a forest benefits only certain wildlife species (i.e. rabbits and quail) at the expense of others. Also it must be questioned how conversion of a Longleaf Pine forest to a hybrid (un-natural) scrub hardwood forest could benefit native wildlife. These dry upland ridges never naturally supported hardwood forests. The native fauna and flora developed in response to the fire-maintained pine forest. Given the level of disturbance planned and the global rarity of the Longleaf Pine forest, it must be suggested that pines be retained (not hardwoods). These islands could then possibly serve as "mini-refugia" for the native fauna and flora (as modified by the increased presence of edge species). Avoidance of "excessive forest fragmentation" and providing for "adequate avenues of dispersal" are mentioned but the activities described actually maximize fragmentation by cutting up the forest into small blocks. We suggest re-wording the sentences claiming benefit for this.	1:29	1:30	The concept of maintaining avenues and corridors has been emphasized in the revised action plan, and use of forested islands de-emphasized.
Page 3-88, para. 2 The citation to Rose (date & title) does not agree with reference cited in the bibliography. Rose's conclusions are also misstated. What Rose (41:514) actually said was: "Although hunting increased the total mortality, the fall populations were not correlated with hunting the preceding year. Thus, greater mortality resulting from hunting was apparently compensated for by a greater production of young, by increased survival of young in summers or falls following hunting, or was masked by other factors such as movements into the study area." In other words, increased production of young might not be the sole factor compensating for greater mortality; there was sufficient habitat	1:31	1:31	The citation in the text (Rose, 1958) and corresponding reference in the bibliography were both incorrect, and the interpretation of Rose's (1977) paper has been re-examined.

to allow increased survival of young as well as a source of immigrants. Habitat management also was stressed by Chapman et al. (Cottontails, p. 83-123, in Wild Mammals of North America. J. A. Chapman and G. A. Feldhamer, eds. Johns Hopkins Press). I wouldn't try to correlate effects of hunting with effects of habitat alteration too strongly; the causes & effects of mortality would not be expected to be the same. Also, it is difficult to assess whether opening habitat will benefit rabbits & other species that reproduce in spring & summer, when heavy vehicle use is expected in these areas. Edge effects are not always positive: lots of human-induced mortality occurs on roadsides.

page 3-89, para. 2
The DEIS states that "no negative impacts" to gopher tortoises are expected to occur by activities since the guidelines of the USFWS Biological Opinion will be followed. Was the 1989 USFWS Opinion limited only to the activities of the Training Facilities EIS? The proposed activities described in this draft EIS may exceed the scope of the Biological Opinion, and further, Section 7 consultation with the USFWS may be required. Further, Section 7(a)(1) and 2(c) of the Endangered Species Act directs federal agencies to use all methods necessary to promote the recovery of listed species.

The FWS Biological Opinion concluded that "the land altering activities as modified by the operating plan contained herein are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of *G. polyphemus*". The biological standard for the opinion is jeopardy, the likelihood of species extinction. Negative effects can occur to individuals or local populations under the jeopardy standard as long as there is no likelihood of species extinction. Draft EIS statements such as "no negative impacts" (page 3-89, para. 2) and "the military mission had no or few negative side-effects on survival of the tortoise" should be clarified by reference to the jeopardy standard. As presently written, statements can be interpreted that activities will have no negative effects on individuals or local populations.

The draft EIS also does not distinguish between species jeopardy and species recovery. The ESA affirmatively requires federal agencies to use their authority to conserve threatened and endangered species. Case law under the ESA is inconsistent on the extent that federal activities are required, under Section 7, to ensure that listed species are either fully recovered (unlisted) or that species jeopardy (likely extinction) is merely avoided. While the FWS Biological Opinion concludes no jeopardy, the EIS should address the extent to which military activities will or will not contribute to species recovery since, as noted in the Opinion, the prospects for recovery rest to a large extent with the NGB/MSARNG and USFS. Extensive suitable,

1:32 Comment noted.

1:33 The 1989 Biological Opinion covered current training activities and those proposed in the Training Facilities EIS. The 1992 and 1993 opinions cover all proposed alternatives in this Final EIS. All opinions are reproduced in Appendix 2.

We note that these opinions concur that no jeopardy is associated with any proposed alternative (except 3B) provided certain monitoring and mitigation procedures are complied with. These actions are described in the added monitoring and mitigation sections within Chapter 3. It is acknowledged that this does not imply that absolutely no negative effects on individuals or local populations may be seen. A new research program designed to gain more basic information on the population dynamics of the tortoise (as discussed in response 1:5) is expected to benefit future management programs.

1:34 Please see the response to Comment 1:33.

1:35 See the responses to Comments 1:3, 1:4, 1:5 and 1:33.

1:36 Comment noted. Discussion of recovery has been added where appropriate when examining the possible effects on the gopher tortoise. We disagree that "Extensive suitable, but unoccupied forest habitat occurs within the proposed maneuver areas," unless this is defined to include other than priority soils. As discussed extensively above, great care has been taken to make virtually all priority soils unavailable for military use.

1:32

1:33

1:34

1:35

1:36

1:36	but unoccupied forested habitat occurs within the proposed maneuver areas. Clearing these sites will remove potential future habitat for gopher tortoises. Proposed activities will likely be detrimental to species recovery.	1:37	The Biological Opinion incorporated the assessment contractor's recommendations and guidelines for relocation of tortoises. Neither these guidelines nor other aspects of the assessment were provided for public review in the DEIS. A relocation plan, as prescribed in the opinion, has not been developed to our knowledge. Relocation is a biologically controversial topic, with conflicting data on the success of the technique. Relocation should be used only as a last resort. Relocation activities will require federal and state permits.
1:38	Management plans for both the gopher tortoise and the red-cockaded woodpecker should include monitoring. Monitoring should include a system of periodic reporting, inspection and review by other involved agencies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks, and the U.S. Forest Service).	1:38	Management activities for the gopher tortoise are identified in the Biological Opinions, located in Appendix L. These activities include monitoring and inspection by other involved agencies and yearly inspections conducted by the USFWS with attendance by state regulatory agencies. (see comments 1:2 and 1:10 for information on RCW).
1:39	Page 3-103, para. 4. Apparently there is a siltation problem. This may prove to be a problem that entails more than simply choking the plants. Pitcher plant bogs and flats are considered to be areas of low nutrient levels, because of this the plants are adapted to these low nutrient levels. If this siltation is coming from areas that have recently been replanted and fertilized, this could drastically alter the plant composition of the bogs and could eventually make them unsuitable for the endemic Camp Shelby burrowing crayfish.	1:39	Of the wetlands at Camp Shelby, it is accepted that the bogs with internal drainage, frequently supporting pitcher plants, may be susceptible to siltation. This is examined in Chapter 3 (Section 3.4.5), and protective measures are proposed. The question of nutrient loss was not previously raised as an issue. Examination of this question, utilizing Soil Conservation Service criteria for excessive nutrient loss, suggest that a change in the previously utilized fertilization rates be made. This is discussed in Section 3.4.5.5 of the Final EIS.
1:40	Page 3-128, para. 2. As mentioned above, there is no mention of the effects of the nutrient run-off on the wetlands. Has this been considered at all?	1:40	See response to comment 1:39.
1:41	Page 3-130, para. 4. Who will be ultimately responsible for controlled burns on Camp Shelby? Controlled burns are essential not only for the gopher tortoise areas and the red-cockaded woodpecker colony areas, but also for the pitcher plant areas. If the USFS holds this responsibility, what will be their priority for burning on Camp Shelby when they have difficulty accomplishing the prescribed burns on their own managed timber lands? Should the National Guard be made primarily responsible for controlled burns on Camp Shelby?	1:41	The Forest Service is responsible for all controlled burns on National Forest administered lands. The National Guard control burns some selected ranges under the supervision a Forest Service Burning Boss.
1:42	Page 3-131, last para., and page 4-8 para. 1-3. Are all islands in maneuver areas >50 acres (also mentioned p.1-27, first paragraph)? The only value as "micro-refuges" that I	1:42	The Forest Service annually determines which areas it plans to burn including burns for Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive (TES) plant and animal species. Acreage control is used to maintain a 3-5 year burning cycle. The areas within the Camp Shelby permit are treated with at least the same intensity as those outside. Burns are basically accomplished within the District-wide 3-5 year cycle.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks (John Burris)

can think of is as havens for forbs, insects & other invertebrates, & possibly (assuming adult-sized trees) as nesting/foraging sites for birds; all or most of these species probably will be "weedy" species. Repeated references to "biodiversity" lead me to believe that biodiversity is here defined as simply the number of species, rather than the naturally-occurring array of species. Leaving micro-refuges and creating edges that benefit blackbirds and starlings over thrushes and titmice, for example, is not the same as increasing biodiversity.

1:42

1:43 See response to comment 1:9.

1:44 Management activities for the gopher tortoise are identified in the Biological Opinions, located in Appendix L. The Mississippi Army National Guard is committed to complying with the requirements of these Biological Opinions.

1:45 Please see the additional coverage added to the EIS in Section 3.5.7.

Page 4-8, Biodiversity
Comments: There is an inappropriate focus on the benefits of creation of edge habitat and its supposed relation to a maximization of biodiversity. While at the narrow local level this might sometimes be true, the supposed increase in diversity is a function of an influx of weedy invaders, generalists that thrive in early successional habitats. Interior species and those adapted to a narrow range of climax or subclimax conditions may disappear. Mississippi has more than its share of demolished habitats. What are lacking, and needed, are more extensive areas of contiguous representative natural habitat.

1:43

1:46 The citation has been corrected.

While adult tortoises can thrive in certain sorts of edge situations, so do a host of nest and juvenile predators. It has not been demonstrated that food plots or fertilized grassy swales developed to control erosion are anything other than attractive nuisances with respect to tortoise recovery. Do they augment reproduction or are they in effect sinks, areas with concentrations of nests and small juveniles vulnerable to predators and to the habitat manipulations (with heavy equipment) necessary to maintain the early successional vegetative structure? What tortoises and red-cockaded woodpeckers need most is large blocks of more or less natural habitat maintained the old-fashioned way--by growing-season fire and natural regeneration.

1:44

Furthermore, the longleaf ecosystem itself is threatened. Mohr estimated that there were 7.7 million acres in longleaf in MS in 1897. Kelly and Bechtold (1991) estimate that MS now has only 270,000 acres in longleaf. Of this, about half is on the NF, and the preponderance is on the Desoto. The Black Creek district currently has 123,569 acres in Longleaf, and plans to convert another 24000 acres to Longleaf. Any large conversion of this ecosystem into something else, as planned by the National Guard, is a diminution of global diversity.

1:45

Page 6-4
The citation to Jack Weil is incorrect. The correct name is Roger Weill (not Ph.D.).

1:46

We were unable to locate these references in the Bibliography: Weatherford McDade (1988), cited on p. 2-21, and Weatherford McDade EIS ('91) on p. 3-14 (I finally found these listed under Camp Shelby Environmental Impact Statement); USDA-FS ('86) on p. 2-25; Young ('44) on p. 2-30; Hooper et al. ('80) on p. 3-19. Also providing an index to topics in the rear of volume I was a nice touch but I found several of the page numbers did not match the subject (the topic was mentioned several pages before or after the indexed page).

Page Q-1 through Q-4
Hexastylis virginica is very unlikely to occur in south Mississippi. *Juglans cinerea* is only likely to occur on Camp Shelby as introduced species around old homesteads and other man influenced areas. We very much doubt the identification of both of these specimens.

In regards to the Leaf River WMA, each of the six alternatives will present a necessity for different management strategies. We do not know which course the Forest Service will take therefore, it would be premature for us to consider modifications to our present management practices without a clear position from the Forest Service.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on this document.

Sincerely,

John L. Burris

John Burris, Director
Bureau of Education/Environmental Services

enclosure

cc: Curtis James, USF&WS
Vicksburg, MS

10

1:47 The citations have been corrected.

1:48 The preparers note that an Index is a required part of an EIS. They regret that some small text changes were made after preparation of the index, which resulted in the discrepancies noted by the commentor.

1:49 The LCTA floristic inventory does indicate that *Hexastylis virginica* has been collected on Camp Shelby. This has been verified by a qualified plant taxonomist, and a voucher specimen will be placed in a local recognized herbarium for additional verification.

1:50 The LCTA floristic inventory does indicate that *Juglans cinerea* has been collected on Camp Shelby. This has been verified by a qualified plant taxonomist; and a voucher specimen will be placed in a local recognized herbarium for additional verification.

1:51 Comment noted.

Page Intentionally Left Blank to Accompany
Mississippi Natural Heritage Program Plant List

SPECIAL PLANTS OF NF IN MISSISSIPPI
BY DISTRICT
MISSISSIPPI NATURAL HERITAGE PROGRAM
February 14, 1992

BLACK CREEK DISTRICT

PDSR01020	AGALINIS APHYLLA	Y
PMPO0C0E0	ANDROPOGON PERANGUSTATUS	Y
PDFB0F2Y2	ASTRAGALUS DISTORTUS VAR ENGELMANNII	?
PMCP031H0	CAREX BALTZELII	?
PMCP034F0	CAREX EXILIS	?
PMCP037B0	CAREX IMPRESSINERVIA	P
PMCP03AK0	CAREX PICTA	Y
PMCP03CC0	CAREX SEORSA	?
PDAST29010	CHRYSOGONUM VIRGINIANUM	P
PMOR0G010	CLEISTES DIVARICATA	Y
PDAST2L0Z0	COREOPSIS HELIANTHOIDES	Y
PDOR01010	CORNUS ALTERNIFOLIA	P
PDER10D010	EPIGAEA REPENS	Y
POTH0C04010	GORDONIA LASIANTHUS	Y
PDAQU01020	ILEX AMELANCHIER	Y
PRAQU010P0	ILEX MYRTIFOLIA	Y
PDLAU07030	LINDERA SUBCITRACEA	?
PDAST6F010	MIKANIA CORDIFOLIA	Y
PMPO4K2U0	PANICUM NUDICAULE	P
PMRA0E020	PELTANDRA SAGITTIFOLIA	Y
PDFAB1A083	PETALOSTEMON GRACILIS	Y
PDLNT01060	PINGUICULA PRIMULIFLORA	Y
PMORC1Y020	PLATANHERA BLEPHARIGLOTTIS	Y
PMORC1Y0C0	PLATANHERA INTEGRAL	Y
PMORC1Y0E0	PLATANHERA LACERA	?
PMARE0B010	RHAPIDOPHYLLUM HYSTRIX	Y
PMCPY0N0H0	RHYNCHOSPORA CRINIPES	Y
PMCPY0N1C0	RHYNCHOSPORA MACRA	Y
PDSCHO1020	SCHISANDRA GLABRA	Y
PDAR0U180	SILENE OVATA	?
POTH0C06010	STEVARTIA MALACCOENDRON	Y
PMXYR010H0	XYRIS SCABRIFOLIA	Y

List of actual, probable, and possible special plants of the Black Creek District, DeSoto NF compiled by the
Mississippi Natural Heritage Program.

Codes	Y	Confirmed present on District
	P	Probable on District - but not confirmed by collection.
	?	Occurrence on District is possible, taxon has been collected in same county.

Responses Begin on the Following Page.

United States Department of Agriculture
Forest Service
National Forests in Mississippi
100 W. Capitol St.
Suite 1141
Jackson, MS 39269
601 965-4391

Reply to: 2720/1920-2

Date: March 6, 1992

Mr. Thomas M. Craven
U. S. Army Engineer District
Mobile District
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

Here are the Forest Service comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) "Military Training Use of National Forest Lands, Camp Shelby, Mississippi" dated November 1991. The enclosed comments represent our response as a cooperating agency on this EIS. An interdisciplinary review was conducted by my Staff and additional comments from within our agency have been incorporated in the enclosed comments.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement will be utilized as the environmental disclosure document for the Forest Service decision regarding the Special Use Permit covering National Forest administered lands being utilized by Camp Shelby. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires that environmental effects of proposed actions be considered and that the public be informed of those impacts. In reviewing the DEIS satisfying these NEPA requirements (consider and inform) is the principal driving force behind our comments. There were numerous areas within the document where we identify a need for further disclosure of effects or clarification of the proposed actions. Our comments are intended to help the EIS better achieve its purpose.

The format utilized for displaying our comments goes sequentially through the document identifying specific changes to text section by section. Every effort was made to be clear and concise as to what changes should be made and where. There are some sections where additional information or analysis was requested. My staff is available to provide any additional information or clarification you may need in addressing our concerns.

Sincerely

Joseph E. Clayton
for
KENNETH R. JOHNSON
Forest Supervisor

Enclosure

J. Long concurs 3/6/9



Caring for the Land and Serving People

FS-6200 286x4 889

As a cooperating agency in preparation of this Environmental Impact Statement, the U.S. Forest Service included editorial comments, noted by an "E" along the right margin of the letter.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

USDA Forest Service comments on:

Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Military Training Use of National Forest Lands
Camp Shelby, Mississippi

Dated: November 1991

OVERALL COMMENTS:

Use both Metric System and U.S. Customary units for values in the EIS.
Section references are often followed by the term "above" or "below" these
directional notes should be removed from the document (global change).
All "TA" in document should be "PTA" throughout document.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Executive Summary will require updating to cover any changes
incorporated in the EIS as a result of comments on the draft. No specific
changes are being suggested until the document has been updated to reflect
changes resulting from this initial comment period.

Page ES-3. In the Description of Alternatives, the proposed actions
(alternatives) are not clearly laid out or understandable as to exactly
what is being proposed. Need a clear description of what habitat
modifications are being proposed.

ADDITION TO GLOSSARY

Sensitive Species. Those plant and animal species identified by a Regional
Forester for which population viability is a concern, as evidenced by:

- Significant current or predicted downward trends in
population numbers or density.
- Significant current or predicted downward trends in habitat
capability that would reduce a species' existing distribution.

Section 1.1.1.1

Paragraph 1, third sentence: Change to read - The actual ownership is
comprised of federal, state and privately owned (leased) lands; with the
majority being federal lands administered by the U.S.D.A. Forest Service.

Figure 2-1 on page 2-3 should be moved up adjacent to Figure 1-3. Change
title of Figure 1-3 to "Tracked Vehicle Training Areas".

Last Paragraph: Change 116,199 to 116,639.

Add a paragraph on the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Department
of Agriculture and Department of Defense following the Forest Plan

2:1 The Executive Summary has been updated and reflects changes from the initial comment period.

2:2 Comment noted.

2:3 This definition has been incorporated in Section 2.4.5.1.5 of the FEIS.

2:4 See additional coverage in Section 1.1.1.

(Comments 2:5 and 2:6 Appear on the Following Page)

2:5 A copy of the Master Agreement between the Department of Defense and the Department of
Agriculture has been added to Appendix A.

2:6 As announced by Secretary of Defense Aspin in December 1993, the proposed mission of the
Army National Guard will focus, in the future, on two roles: a wartime combat arms mission and a
domestic emergency mission. This is in some contrast to the variety of past roles and accompanying
force structure, in which the Guard more or less mirrored all active Army functions. In this new
organizational structure, the Army Reserve will assume the major responsibility for combat service
support missions. The National Guard is proposed to gain artillery, aviation, mechanized infantry, and
armor units, among others. Some Army Reserve units whose role is combat arms will transfer to the
National Guard, while others will be disestablished as part of the general downsizing of the forces. This
clearly contrasts with suggestions that the guard role should focus on support missions and lose its
heavy combat arms role.

The Army National Guard (ARNG) force structure for the future, as directed by the Army, will
include increased numbers of Armor units equipped with the Main Battle Tanks (M-1 series), Bradley
Fighting Vehicles (M2/M3) and Armored Personnel Carriers in the M113 series. The ARNG will also
receive increased numbers of tracked field artillery pieces as well as other combat and tracked vehicles.
The Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee ARNG units train their armor forces at Camp Shelby. If
Camp Shelby is not available, remaining active Army installations would be unable to support the
training needs of the local and regional ARNG units now training at Camp Shelby. The requirement to
provide facilities on training weekends and during the (summer) Annual Training period now exceeds
the capability of available active Army installations.

The National Guard has both a federal and state mission. The federal mission is primary, and is
national defense. The National Guard plays a primary role in the defense of the United States. With
future force reductions, the National Guard is predicted to play an even more critical role. This is
evidenced by a recent statement in a National Guard Bureau (NGB) Message, Subject: NGB Position
Paper Operation BOLD SHIFT, dated 3 January 1992, made by the FORCES COMMAND
(FORSCOM) Commander, "The action plan, titled BOLD SHIFT, builds on our insights from the recent
Persian Gulf Crisis and exploits the impressive potential of our reserve forces to execute increasingly
important roles in the current defense strategy." FORCES COMMAND is the headquarters responsible
for the training of all Army units to include the National Guard and the Army Reserve. The primary
mission of any military organization is deterrence. Deterrence is accomplished only by maintaining a
strong, well trained force. For future conflicts, time will not allow the maintenance of a military which
requires a draft and training of personnel and units to fight a war. It would take well over a year,
possibly two years, to implement a draft and train and deploy even a minimally qualified, combat ready
brigade. With the increasing role of the National Guard, it is imperative that effective training be
conducted, and adequate training areas and facilities be provided.

Standards and Guidelines cited on page 1-7, also add a copy of HOU to the EIS Appendix.

Section 1.1.2

Need a paragraph spelling out role National Guard is to play in overall defense scheme as seen by Department of Army. What is role in 5 years? What are the minimum training requirements to meet this role? What is role of Alabama and Tennessee Brigades.

Page 1-8, paragraph 4: Discusses current training/consolidated TMA. Need to show and discuss acres outside tank fans and refugees in consolidated TMA available for use.

Section 1.1.5

Paragraph 2: A brief description of content of what is being incorporated by reference in the Training Facilities Final EIS should be included.

Need an additional paragraph that spells out the decisions to be made as a part of the Record of Decision concerning the Facilities EIS.

Section 1.1.6

Need a paragraph in Appendix S explaining the derivation of the values used in the development of the Environmental Constraint Map for Camp Shelby (figure 1-5).

Section 1.2

Description of alternatives are not clear. It does not present a clear and complete picture of the proposed actions. The descriptions should be comprehensive and written so that anyone not familiar with Camp Shelby operations has a understanding of what activities are proposed.

Figure 1-6, page 1-20:

This figure combines all PTA's and corridor sets is only for all alternatives. Why not show separate for each alternative? Proper figure for Alternative 4 is 1-3. Show figure for Alternative 5. Put Figure 1-6 as a fold out in the back where it can be left open for reference while reviewing the document.

Table 1-2, page 1-21 thru 1-23:

Show a separate figure showing the training areas, corridor sets, facilities and improvements applicable for each alternative and place summary of alternative under each figure.

Alternative 1, page 1-21:

Add facilities from Facilities FEIS that would be included.

Paragraph 2: Should read 1, 2, 3 and set #'s 3 / 3, 4.

(Continuation of Response 2:6 from Previous Page) Current battle doctrine, "Air and Battle," emphasizes the offense rather than the defense. Air and Battle Doctrine requires a larger, more rapidly moving force in order to survive and win on the battlefield. More lethal, complex, faster weapons systems have increased the amount of land needed for effective training of a combat maneuver brigade. The older weapons system and a defensive strategy required engagement of the enemy from a stationary position. The newer weapons system (M1 series tank) and an offensive strategy provides for and requires the engagement of the enemy while on the move. The use of effective combined arms teams means that all required elements coordinate and train together to include armor (tanks), artillery (cannons), air (aircraft), and support (supply, fuel, etc.). The battalion level task force is the lowest level at which all elements of that combined arms team come together. The 155th Armor Brigade, Mississippi Army National Guard, is a primary user of Camp Shelby. The 155th Armor Brigade is not scheduled for any future deactivation and is a high priority unit. The armor brigades of Tennessee and Alabama also use Camp Shelby as their primary annual training site. All three brigades store, on a permanent basis, equipment that is maintained by the Camp Shelby full time workforce. Other armor units, such as the 108th Armored Cavalry Squadron, also use Camp Shelby as their primary training area and store equipment at Camp Shelby. The number of armor units that use Camp Shelby as their primary training site and mobilization site certainly amplifies the need for this action. The mobilization mission of Camp Shelby also necessitates the need for battalion task force training.

The 155th Armor Brigade mobilized at Camp Shelby during DESERT SHIELD/DESERT STORM. The unit had to move to Fort Hood, Texas to conduct maneuver training because of the lack of adequate training area available for use at Camp Shelby. The approval of Alternative 1 would allow units to complete any required post-mobilization training at Camp Shelby. A Government Accounting Office report evaluated the 155th Brigade, and listed some valid shortcomings that need future emphasis. The Department of Defense response to the GAO Report was also included in the report and identifies many incorrect statements made in the report. One point deserves re-statement. The Active Army units had most of the same types of problems, with some being more severe than among the Reserve Components. The National Guard Bureau Message, Subject: DESERT SHIELD/STORM Facts, dated 20 Aug 91, and concerning the mobilization, says, in part: (There were) 60 organizations led by Lieutenant Colonels or higher (which) performed duty in Southwest Asia. The mean average time to deploy was 31 days. This was from the day the unit was federalized to the day the unit arrived in Southwest Asia. 94%+ of the ARNG soldiers called to duty were deployable. Of the 6% non-deployable, 75% were due to not having completed recent required training. The non-deployment comparison at that time showed that the Regular Army units had 12.5% of its personnel who could not move with their unit, while Army National Guard units were unable to deploy only 6% of their strength. We feel that the Reserve Component personnel have had to prove that they could meet the standards while the Active Component was assumed to be up to standard. Nevertheless, the GAO Report does not recommend change in any of the training standards or requirements of Reserve Component units.

Several of the deficiencies which were observed, especially in the case of the 155th Armored Brigade, are directly related to Camp Shelby conditions. The observation that tank gunnery skills were inadequate due to practice on a familiar, unchallenging range, is exactly the reason for proposing the more modern Tank Table VIII and Multipurpose Range Complex - Heavy, which provide more realistic experience. The findings relating to inadequate leadership skills in executing large unit maneuvers also relate to the lack of opportunity to practice such skills at the unit's home station. While suggestions about deficiencies in noncommissioned officer performance are more generalized, one must infer that improving the opportunity to practice these skills in the field in realistic situations would lead to development of these abilities.

(Responses to Comments 2:7, 2:8, 2:9, 2:10, 2:11, 2:12 and 2:13 Appear on the Following Page)

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

Paragraph 4: Should read acres not presently used for maneuver, and it is 36,349 not currently used for maneuver.	E	
Alternative #2, page 1-21: Same as Alternative 1.	E	(Comments 2:7, 2:8, 2:9, 2:10, 2:11, 2:12 and 2:13 Appear on the Previous Page)
Alternative #3, page 1-21: Alternative #3a needs to be separated from #3b; show figures and alternative summary separately.	E	2:7 See response to comment 2:6.
Alternative #4, page 1-22: Need to include facilities from the Facilities FEIS. Alternative needs to be fully developed, show net useable acres.	E	2:8 See response to comment 2:6.
Section 1.2.0.1.2 Paragraph 1: add "and sedimentation" after "soil erosion".	E	2:9 Additional analysis of current training activities, i.e. Alternative 4, has been incorporated throughout the document.
Section 1.2.0.1.4 Paragraph 1: Define FORSCOM either here or in Appendix C. Page 1-24, paragraph 2: Add "Home Location" to list. Page 1-24, paragraph 6: Include an explanation of "readiness levels". Page 1-25, paragraph 10 "Firing Activities": This section should describe the proposed schedule of firing activity. The use of firing ranges needs to be clarified as to what current and expected use is under the current permit. Page 1-26, paragraph 1: The number of week days need to be reduced should be in the past tense rather than the future tense (change "will be" to "were"). Should include "Weekday firing is currently limited to AT".	E	2:10 See revised text in Section 1.1.5.
Section 1.2.0.2 Paragraph 6, first sentence: Add after trails "within the maneuver corridors".	E	2:11 See additional text in Section 1.1.
Section 1.2.0.3.1 Third paragraph, second line: After weekends add "in addition to AT".	E	2:12 Additional description has been added to Section 1.1.6.
Section 1.2.0.3.4 The title should read "Areas No Longer Useable for Track Maneuver".	E	2:13 Text has been modified to better present descriptions of the alternatives.
Section 1.2.0.3.6 First paragraph:	E	2:14 Incorporated in Section 1.1.2.3.
	E	2:15 Category has been added to text table in Section 1.2.1.1.4.
	E	2:16 Please see additional text in Section 1.2.1.1.4.
	E	2:17 The requested information is included in Section 1.2.1.1.4 of the FEIS.

Delete Sentences 3, 4 and 5. Beginning with: "The question which... and ending with ...the wetland so protected?"	2:18	2:18	Modification has been made.
Last sentence: delete "a" and "of this question" then insert a period after "discussion".	2:19	2:19	Text has been modified in Section 1.2.1.4.6.
<u>Section 1.2.0.3.7</u>			
First sentence: Delete "some" and insert "the" and delete "managers". Place a period after "Service".	E		Section 1.2.1.4.8 describes proposed closures of Highway 29. No significant changes from present are proposed.
Combine last two sentences by deleting: "has not been fully answered. This issue"	E		Both option descriptions have been revised to describe the two options for company training - one area containing three maneuver areas and two areas containing three maneuver areas each. This should clear up the misunderstanding which precipitated the question.
<u>ADD A NEW SECTION:</u>			
<u>Section 1.2.0.3.8 Highway 29 Closure</u>			
Discuss closure of Highway 29 when firing points East of the highway are in use. This discussion should cover expected periods of closure as well as frequency.	2:20	2:20	Comment noted.
<u>Section 1.2.0.4</u>			
Option 1, second sentence: Delete "training areas" and add "battalion task force maneuver area". (NOTE: Option 1 and 2 need a better description.)	2:21		The information requested has been added to Figures 1-12 through 1-15.
Option 2, end of paragraph: Note there are 2 company team areas and alternative 2 does not meet criteria.	2:22		This information is described in some detail in Section 1.1.5, and is summarized in Table 1-4. See also response to comment 2:10.
Page 1-29: Need a new figure showing the relation of the tank fan, impact area and buffer to the PTA's.	2:23		The modification has been made.
<u>Section 1.2.0.5</u>			
Second paragraph, third sentence: delete "assessment" and add "Environmental Analysis".	E		
<u>Section 1.2.1 through Section 1.2.5</u>			
Add statement to each section that identifies the applicable facilities from the Facilities FEIS for each Alternative.	2:24		
<u>Section 1.2.1</u>			
Page 1-32, second paragraph: Delete last sentence. (NOTE: This is a conclusion and does not belong until the end of this document after all impacts have been disclosed and evaluated, Section 4 - Conclusions and Recommendations).	2:25		
<u>Section 1.2.2</u>			
Third paragraph, last sentence: Delete "revealed" and insert "identified".	E		

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

NOTE: The Alternative Map and description should be together.

Page 1 33, Figure 1-8: Add Corridor set numbers.

Section 1.2.3

Section description: Change "Alternative 3" to "Alternatives 3A & 3B"

Note: Delete "sub-option" and add "alternative" in all needed places. This is a comparison of alternatives.

Alternative 3A, last paragraph, page 1-35: Delete "and would provide troops with somewhat greater experience than is possible under the existing configuration and might develop more experienced companies".

Alternative 3B, page 1-37: Need a better description of "multi-company".

Section 1.2.4

Alternative 4: Need a map showing Alternative 4.

Section 1.2.5

Alternative 5, first sentence, first paragraph: Delete "option" insert "alternative".

Section 1.2.6

Second sentence delete "would be closed and all National Forest land" and replace "the USFS for management" with "multiple use management by the Forest Service".

Section 1.2.7

Second paragraph: This Alternative should be considered and not removed.

Add new paragraph: "Use of Other Facilities: Move first paragraph from page 1-35 into this section. "Battalions will be...." Note: This section should address the procedural issue provided for in the Master Agreement which requires analysis to substantiate that no other military reservations are available for maneuver training.

Section 1.3.1

Page 1-43, Tank Table VIII: Correct legend on Figure 1-13. Delete all things that do not pertain to the map.

Section 1.3.2

Identify and discuss the training needs as they relate to readiness levels, that drive this requirement. Provide justification for this proposed action in the document.

2:26 The modification has been made.

2:27 The modification has been made.

2:28 The modification has been made.

2:29 The modification has been made.

2:30 Comment noted.

2:31 A survey conducted by the Defense Training and Performance Data Center in Orlando, Florida indicated that the nearest facility capable of providing the training facilities comparable to Camp Shelby is Fort Polk, Louisiana. As this site is used on a regular basis by the active army components, additional utilization opportunities are not available. The utilization of distant training sites, i.e. the National Training Center at Fort Irwin, CA, requires a great amount of funding and reduces training time. Utilization of distant training sites would drastically reduce the number of training opportunities, therefore causing a reduction in the mission readiness. The results of this study has been added to Section 1.2.9.

2:32 Additional coverage has been provided.

2:29

2:30

2:31

E

2:32

Section 1.3.4

Clarify disposition of ON-SITE hazardous waste. Need to discuss where it is being disposed of and under what authority. Disposal can not be on Forest Service administered lands.

Section 1.3.5

Page 1-55, second paragraph: Delete the second and third sentences. Delete "preferred" on Sites 1, 2, 3 and 6.
Page 1-56, Figure 1-18, need numbers to show which ones are preferred for this EIS.

Section 1.3.6

Page 1-58, Option 1, first sentence: Change to read - "Four potential assembly areas have been identified, three of which will be developed."
Page 1-58, Option 1, last sentence: Change "No thinning" to "Some removal".
Page 1-58, last paragraph: (Referencing Table 3-11) - The size of the TOC does not agree.
Page 1-58, Option 2, second paragraph, third sentence: Delete - "Other types of mechanized infantry and engineer ARTEP tasks may also be performed in the area when it is not being utilized for CALFEX concurrent training."

ADD NEW SECTIONS

Section 1.3.7 East Range Road

Section 1.3.8 ect.

Need to add a section for each facility located in the Operations Area and addressed in the Facilities FEIS that is being incorporated into this EIS. The section should include a brief description of the facility and reference the Facilities FEIS and ROD.

Section 1.4

First paragraph: Need to include - "The Forest Service Record of Decision on facilities located in the Operations Area and addressed in the Facilities FEIS will be issued concurrently with the Record of Decision for this Environmental Impact Statement."

Second paragraph, sixth line: replace "assessment" with "analysis"; ninth line replace "such as" with "by"; tenth line after "no" insert "conflict with" and delete "(Appendix Q)" reference.

Page 1-59, last paragraph: Change "decision" to "site specific disclosure".

2:33 Hazardous waste was treated in the Open Burning/Open Detonation Site (OB/OD) under emergency permits from the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). In compliance with the DEQ Administrative Order at Appendix D of the EIS, the site was clean-closed. Excess increment bags and munitions are currently disposed in accordance with sections 6-7 and 6-8 of AR 200-1; hazardous waste regulations do not apply.

2:34 The change has been made.

2:35 The change has been made.

2:36 The sites are evaluated in Section 3.3, and the preferred sites identified in Section 4.1.1.2.6.

2:37 Text has been modified.

2:38 Text has been modified.

2:39 Acreage values have been cross-checked among sections.

2:40 Change has been made.

2:41 See response to comments 2:10 and 2:24.

2:42 The material provided has been incorporated in Section 1.5.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

<p><u>Section 2.1</u></p> <p>Last sentence: Replace "lies" with "is located".</p> <p><u>Section 2.1.1.1</u></p> <p>Second paragraph: Insert the following sentence - "Part of the Ammunition supply point is on National Forest land."</p> <p><u>Section 2.1.1.2</u></p> <p>End of the first sentence add: ("Figure 2-1").</p> <p>First paragraph, after last sentence, insert: "A special study was conducted during those years and has not been repeated since."</p> <p>Page 2-3, second paragraph: Change "Appendix C-8" to "Appendix C" (Actual reference in on page C-59.)</p> <p>Page 2-8: Figure 2-1 should also be in Chapter 1 on pages 1-5 or 1-6.</p> <p>ADD NEW SECTION on AT explaining why it has to occur during the period May through August. Can AT occur in October?</p> <p><u>Section 2.1.2.1</u></p> <p>First paragraph, second sentence, add: "General" before "Use" then follow sentence with - "The National Guard is responsible for enforcing the use closure."</p> <p>Need a separate figure to show impact area, buffer area and safety fan.</p> <p><u>Section 2.1.2.3</u></p> <p>In the title Change "off limits" to "Restricted" and also in text section.</p> <p>Change last sentence to read: "Other areas include the Ragland Hills area where foot traffic only is invited. Several parcels of land are restricted because of private ownership or other reasons (Appendix A)."</p> <p><u>Section 2.3.2.1</u></p> <p>Delete "Effects" in title.</p> <p>Page 2-15, first paragraph, delete: "though it is unlikely"; also delete: "area" after each Wilderness.</p> <p><u>Section 2.3.2.2</u></p> <p>Content of this section should be moved to Chapter 3 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p>The reference in second sentence is not in bibliography.</p>	<p>2:43 Reference has been inserted.</p> <p>2:44 Text has been modified</p> <p>2:45 Original reference was to appendix C, part 8, rather than to page C-8. Text has been changed.</p> <p>2:46 Comment noted. Preparers believe the information in this figure is more closely related to coverage in Chapter 2.</p> <p>2:47 Additional coverage has been included in Section 1.2.1.1.4 which explains this scheduling need.</p> <p>2:48 Text has been modified.</p> <p>2:49 These elements have been added to Figure 2-1.</p> <p>2:50 Text has been modified.</p> <p>2:51 Text has been modified.</p> <p>2:52 Text has been modified.</p> <p>2:53 Text has been modified.</p> <p>2:54 The content pertaining to wildlife has been moved to Chapter 3, Section 3.1.5.4.</p>	<p>E</p> <p>E</p> <p>E</p> <p>2:43</p> <p>2:44</p> <p>2:45</p> <p>2:46</p> <p>2:47</p> <p>2:48</p> <p>2:49</p> <p>2:50</p> <p>2:51</p> <p>2:52</p> <p>2:53</p> <p>2:54</p> <p>E</p>
---	--	---

<u>Section 2.3.3.1</u>		
Add a paragraph on discussion of Salt Domes.	2:55	2:55 See additional coverage in Section 2.3.3.2.
<u>Section 2.3.3.2</u>		
First paragraph, fifth line: Change "42 active" to "32 active"; sixth line change "42,505 acres" to "31,378 acres"; Delete last sentence in paragraph: "The potential of..."	2:56	2:56 Text has been modified. 2:57 Change has been made.
<u>Section 2.3.5.2</u>		
Page 2-19, under "5. Saturated" - change: "between 30" to "between 20".	2:57	2:58 Text has been revised.
<u>Section 2.4.1</u>		
Page 2-23, third paragraph, delete "leucophylla".	2:58	2:59 The suggested material has been included in the new section 2.4.6.5, which discusses fire ecology.
Add following paragraph at end of section: The understory of grasses and shrubs are maintained through frequent burning, either wildfire or prescribed fire. Prescribe burning on a three to five year cycle maintains the vegetation in an open condition with a low shrub component. Prescribe fires are intentional burns made under specific conditions to produce fires of low intensity removing the top needle/leaf layer, killing small brush, and leaving the humus layer intact.	2:59	2:60 A section entitled <i>Proposed Botanical Areas</i> (2.4.1.1) has been added to Chapter 2. 2:61 Comment noted.
<u>ADD NEW SECTION:</u>		
<u>Section 2.4.1.1 Proposed Botanical Areas</u>	2:60	2:62 The consequences, socioeconomic as well as biophysical, of present activities are presented in Chapter 3.
The National Forests in Mississippi Land and Resource Management Plan identified two areas within the permit area as potential botanical areas, the Loblolly Bay area and the Ragland Hills area. The forty acre Loblolly Bay area is one of only two locations within the state which contains the Loblolly Bay. The 286 acre Ragland Hills area is part of a larger tract of private land containing several species of plants unique to this part of Mississippi. The private tract has been targeted for acquisition.		
<u>Section 2.4.2</u>		
First paragraph, delete: "Grazing leases are available for National Forest system lands, however, there are no current leases for lands within the Camp Shelby area. The last grazing lease expired in 1989, and there has been no interest expressed since".	2:61	
<u>Section 2.4.3.1</u>		
Add "tabular breakdown by county dollars earned and effect by Act".	2:62	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

Fourth sentence, add: ", based on acreage of National Forest System lands within the county." after "Forest receipts"

Delete last two sentences and add following table:

PAYMENTS TO COUNTIES					
DESOTO NATIONAL FOREST					
COUNTY	NP ACRES	1990 RETURNS	1991 RETURNS	10 YR. AVE.	
FORREST	49,525	\$212,556	\$176,126	\$230,001	
GEORGE	8,781	37,507	31,077	36,095	
GREENE	33,191	141,772	117,468	118,707	
HARRISON	61,469	262,558	221,253	252,420	
JACKSON	18,615	79,341	66,518	75,988	
JONES	32,951	140,747	116,619	132,419	
PEARL RIVER	3,805	16,253	13,466	15,939	
PERRY	161,849	691,321	572,949	649,304	
STONE	41,834	178,860	148,198	148,119	
WAYNE	90,146	385,049	319,040	361,087	
TOTAL	502,166	\$2,145,975	\$1,782,714	\$2,010,195	
AVERAGE PER ACRE		\$4.27	\$3.55	\$4.00	

Section 2.4.4.3

First sentence: Delete "attracts" replace with "provides habitat for".

Section 2.4.4.4

Include list of reptiles and amphibians in Appendix Q from Facilities FEIS.

Section 2.4.4.6

Include list of invertebrates in Appendix Q from Facilities FEIS.

Figure 2-5, page 2-27 change title to "Known locations of habitat or Historical Occurrence of Threatened and Endangered Species".

ADD A NEW SECTION:

2:63

2:63 Comment has been incorporated but moved to Section 2.6.3.1.

2:64 See response to comment 2:62. Tabular material provided has been added in appropriate location.

2:65 A list of reptiles and amphibians has been included in Appendix Q of the FEIS.

2:66 See response to comment 2:65.

2:67 The caption has been modified.

2:68 A discussion of the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area has been added as Section 2.4.6.

2:64

E

2:65

2:66

2:67

2:68

Section 2.4.4.7 Leaf River Wildlife Management Area

The Leaf River Wildlife Management area was created in ??? by cooperative agreement with the Mississippi Department of Game and Fish as a wildlife refuge and re-stocking area. It was the first game management area created in the state. Deer were brought into the area from Wisconsin. As the herd flourished, surplus animals were trapped and shipped throughout the state to stock other game management areas. Through protection and management, the turkey population also dramatically increased and provided a source for trapping and supplemental stocking in other areas of the state. The term game management area was changed to wildlife management area in 1982.

The forest cover types are typical of the Black Creek District with pine and hardwood making up about 80% of the area. The shortage of hardwood and pine/hardwood stands has resulted in little or no regeneration cutting taking place in these stands, most of which are 40-60 years old. The age of the pine timber varies from newly cut stands to a few stands approaching 80 years old. About 9% is newly cut or planted, 19% from 4 to 23 years old, 25% from 24 to 53, and 47% from 54-73. The stands less than 25 years old average about 35 acres.

Section 2.4.5.1:

Replace entire section with the following:

"Camp Shelby is within the historical and/or current ranges of several federally listed threatened or endangered animal species. They are the red-cockaded woodpecker, eastern indigo snake, gopher tortoise, dusky gopher frog, American alligator, Louisiana black bear and bald eagle. The yellow-blotched sawback turtle was recently listed as a threatened species. Although not known to occur on Camp Shelby, it is known to occur in class 3 streams in close proximity to the installation."

Section 2.4.5.1.1

Include the following under this section - "Desoto Population. The Desoto population occurs in longleaf pines on three Ranger Districts. There are seven (7) active colonies on the Biloxi District, one (1) on the Black Creek District and eight (8) on the Chickasawhay District. These small isolated populations are vulnerable because sub-populations are widely separated, and have low numbers of active colonies that are widely scattered and unable to exchange genetic material. Cavity competitors and undesirable midstories are also problems in some colony sites. In the late 1970s, there were over 20 active colonies of RCW on the Black Creek Ranger District. Hurricane Fredrick destroyed 9 active trees in 1970 and by 1983 the district only had 10 active colonies. By 1991, there was just 1 active colony.

Burning of the longleaf forests on the DeSoto creates an open habitat, but a lack of older trees, damage from hurricanes and low RCW populations have not expanded the RCW there. Recent augmentation, the bringing in of juvenile female birds, was successful in 4 out of 6 attempts."

Page 2-29, first paragraph, line number 11: replace ">9" with ">5".

2:69 Comment noted. This section has been revised to correct some classification errors in the DEIS.

2:70 This section has been revised to incorporate the suggestion. Information on current RCW inventory has been furnished and entered as a map layer in GRASS.

2:68

2:69

2:70

E

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

Page 2-30, first line, rewrite remainder of paragraph to read as follows:

"Fifteen red-cockaded woodpecker colony sites (inactive) are known to occur on Camp Shelby. A ground and aerial survey was conducted in 1991 (Appendix N) to try and locate any active red-cockaded woodpecker trees but none were found. The U.S. Forest Service records for the Black Creek District also show no remaining active colonies on Camp Shelby."

Add following text to end of section:

"Dusky gopher frog (*Bufo arvalis nevosa*)

At present, there are only two locations where this species is known to occur. Breeding ponds in Mississippi have been found in Harrison County only. A survey of all upland, ephemeral ponds within the Camp Shelby area is needed to verify its presence or absence within these habitat locales.

Bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucoccephalus*)

Although occasionally observed along the Leaf River, this species is considered a transient or migrant or no nests are found within Camp Shelby or the DeSoto National Forest."

Section 2.4.5.1.2

Second paragraph: Change "endangered" to "threatened".

Add following text to section:

"Louisiana black bear (*Ursus americanus luteolus*)

Although no recent sightings have been reported in the area, bears have wandered near to or within the permit area from the Pascagoula River Game Management Area (20 miles SE of Camp Shelby), where a small breeding population is known to exist."

Section 2.4.5.1.3

Incorporate the following into this section:

2.4.5.1.3 Sensitive Fauna (Animals)

A sensitive species is one that has been identified by the Regional Forester for which population viability is a concern, as evidenced by:

- a. Significant current or predicted downward trends in population numbers or density.
- b. Significant current or predicted downward trends in habitat capability that would reduce a species' existing distribution. (Forest Service Manual 2670).

Bachman's sparrow (*Ammodramus aestivalis*)

These sparrows have been found in Perry county, and likely occur on Camp Shelby. Typical habitat is open pastures, open woodlands, and dense grasslands with small trees.

2:71

2:71 Comment noted. Augmentation information was provided in answer to Commentor 14, comment 22 and may be used to clarify proposed paragraph.

2:72

2:72 The dusky gopher frog is a candidate species for listing. It has not been proposed for listing and is on the Forest Service Sensitive Species list. The material has been incorporated.

2:73

2:73 Additions are reflected in revised section. The paragraph pertaining to the Louisiana black bear has been added to Section 2.4.5.1.2.

2:74

2:74 This section has been revised to incorporate the suggestion.

2:73

2:74

Black pine snake (*Pituophis melanoleucus lodingi*)

The black pine snake prefers sandy sites in longleaf pine forests. This snake has been collected in Forrest and Perry counties and is known to occur on Camp Shelby in at least three locations.

Bluenose shiner (*Notropis volakei*)

Recorded from Pierce's creek in the maneuver area (Perry County). Found in streams with abundant aquatic vegetation.

Camp Shelby burrowing crayfish (*Fallicambarus gordonii*)

Refer to Figure 2-6 for known locations of sensitive species. Endemic to Mississippi and known only from Camp Shelby, this species is generally confined to the upper reaches of the Cypress Creek watershed and is strongly associated with pitcher plant bogs (Fitzpatrick, 1991). The specific sites Fitzpatrick surveyed and those in which this species was collected are listed in Appendix E. In a study initiated by USACERL and Camp Shelby for use in this EIS, Fitzpatrick (1991) concluded that the population does not appear to be threatened by military activities and is secure under the current levels of protection.

- NEED TO INCLUDE BRIEF DISCUSSIONS OF THESE ALSO-

Golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*)
Lavender burrowing crayfish (*Fallicambarus byersi*)
Mobile crayfish (*Procambarus lecontei*)
Pine woods snake (*Rhadinocoea flavilata*)
Rainbow snake (*Farancia erytrogramma*)
Southeastern shrew (*Sorex longirostris longirostris*)
Southern hog-nose snake (*Heterodon simus*)
Spiny-tailed crayfish (*Procambarus fitzpatricki*)

Section 2.4.5.1.4

Move Black Bear paragraph to Section 2.4.5.1.2

Section 2.4.5.2

Incorporate following in section:

No federally listed threatened or endangered plant species are known to occur on Camp Shelby. However, species found in the DeSoto National Forest are currently listed by the Regional Forester as being sensitive (USDA-FS, 1991).

Coastal plain foxglove

Agalinus apylla

"Pitcher Plant Bogs"

12

2:75 Suggested changes have been made. The paragraph pertaining to the black bear is included in Section 2.4.5.1.2.

2:76 The text provided has been incorporated.

2:74

2:75

2:76

Response to Comment 2:76 on Previous Page

Myrtle holly	<u>Ilex myrtifolia</u>	"Pitcher Plant Bogs"
Fine barrens prairie clover	<u>Petalostemon gracilis</u>	Seasonally wet areas in pine savannahs and flatwoods
Silky Camellia	<u>Stewartia malacodendron</u>	
Incised groovebur, agrimony, cocklebur, needle-grass	<u>Agrimonie incisa</u>	Sandy open pine-oak forest
Southern 3-awned grass, wire-grass	<u>Aristida simpliciflora</u>	Longleaf pine-wiregrass savannahs
Spreading pogonia rosebud orchid	<u>Cleistes divaricata</u>	Pine savannahs and flatwoods, bogs, swamps
Texas pipewort	<u>Eriocaulon tomentosum</u>	Bogs, swamps, moist pinelands
Loblolly Bay	<u>Gordonia lasianthus</u>	Evergreen shrub bogs, pond-cypress depressions, swamps
Juneberry holly, sarvis holly	<u>Ilex amelanchier</u>	Stream banks through flatwoods, titi swamps, bogs
Bog button	<u>Lachnocaulon digynum</u>	Seepage bogs, wet exposed sands, pond edges
Bog spicebush	<u>Lindera subcoriacea</u>	Bogs, esp. with deep peats, bay heads
Big floating heart	<u>Nymphoides aquatica</u>	Ponds and swamp forests, lower plain
Naked-stemmed panicum	<u>Panicum nudicaulis</u>	Sphagnum bogs
Chapman's butterwort,	<u>Pinquicula plainifolia</u>	Bogs, flatwood depressions, ditches, pond margins
Southern yellow fringed orchid	<u>Platanthera integra</u>	Boggy depressions in savannahs, flatwoods, prairies; edges of shrub bogs
Spin palm, needle palm	<u>Rhapidophyllum hystrix</u>	Moist to wet floodplain of small woodland streams; seepage areas in ravines and bayheads

2:76

Large beaked rush	Rhynchospora macro	Bogs, wet pine savannas and flatwoods	2:76
Harper's yelloweye grass	Xyris scabrifolia	"Pitcher Plant Bogs" moist to wet sandy parts of bogs and seepage areas	2:76
<u>Section 2.5</u>			
Page 2-35, second line: Delete Table 2-4 if Harrison County is used or add to the table.			
Page 2-35, third line: Replace "The contrast" with "There is a contrast"			
<u>Section 2.5.1.</u>			
Page 2-39 Figure 2-7: Add National Forest land to legend.			
Second sentence: Replace "administers its" with "administers National Forest"			
<u>Section 2.5.3.1</u>			
First paragraph: Delete "excellent".			
<u>Section 3.1.1.2</u>			
First paragraph, second sentence: Replace "Appendix C-8" with "Appendix C, page C-59"			
Second paragraph, first sentence: (QUESTION) - What about the A-weighted firing noise?			
Need a better explanation of the social impact of the noise.			
Second paragraph: After first sentence add sentence on effect of general tank maneuver noise on local residences, distance to closest residence, etc. Add figure showing current residences within and adjacent to the Camp Shelby boundary.			
Page 3-2, Table 3-1, first paragraph: Replace "Appendix C-8" with "Appendix C, page C-59".			
Page 3-3, first paragraph, line seven: Replace "area south" with "or Leaf Wilderness which are located South and East"			

- 2:77 Editorial comment was accepted.
- 2:78 Original reference was to appendix C, part 8, rather than to page C-8. Text has been changed.
- 2:79 By definition, impulse noise should be measured on the C-weighted scale. See Appendix I for a discussion. If firing noise were to be measured on the A-weighted scale, low frequencies would be less emphasized, and measurements would show lower levels. Use of the C-scale emphasizes, rather than minimizing, effects of heavy weapons.
- 2:80 See additional material and discussion of noise and its consequences in Section 3.1.5.
- 2:81 A discussion of vehicle noise has been added as Section 3.1.5.3.
- 2:82 A series of figures has been added which display the relation between residences and other land uses and military noise contours.
- 2:83 Original reference was to appendix C, part 8, rather than to page C-8. Text has been changed.
- 2:84 Text has been changed.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

Page 3-3. Under Aircraft Noise, line thirteen: Replace "Black Creek Wilderness Area" with "Black Creek Wilderness and Leaf Wilderness." and replace ", both of which" with "These areas are located to the South and East of ..."	2:85	2:85 Text has been modified.
Second paragraph: Include the Study Reference on 3-3 and include in the Recommendation Section 4.2.	2:86	2:86 Text has been modified.
Page 3-3, last paragraph: Reference the analysis indicating "no significant effects" the reference given in first paragraph on page 3-4 is incorrect.	2:87	2:87 The reference has been corrected but is now located in the last paragraph of Section 3.1.5.2.
Page 3-4: Add 2.3.2.2. as referenced earlier.	2:88	2:88 Citation added.
<u>Section 3.1.1.4</u>		
Need to add a soil loss table similar to the one in the National Forests in Mississippi Land and Resource Management Plan, Appendix L, for current maneuver areas and ranges. It should show and discuss annual losses before and after mitigation.	2:89	2:89 The referenced table has been incorporated.
First paragraph, line 6: delete "hydrological" insert "drainage classes".	2:90	2:90 The change has been made, and material is now located in Section 3.1.1.3.
Page 3-5, second paragraph, add new second sentence to read: "This document was prepared by the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, Mississippi State University and is referred to hereafter simply as "Erosion Control Plan" (1988)."	2:91	2:91 Comment incorporated but moved to Section 3.1.1.3.
Page 3-5, second paragraph, line 1: Delete "excellent"	2:92	2:92 Text has been changed.
Page 3-5, second paragraph, line 5: Replace "Their land" with "The land".	2:93	2:93 Text has been changed.
Last paragraph: Add sentence on possible soil contamination from fuels, field maintenance activities ect.	2:94	2:94 A new section 3.1.1.3.5 has been added which acknowledges this potential problem.
Figure 3-1 and 3-2, page 3-6 and 3-7: Graphs need to be updated with current information with results of the full survey. The estimated vegetal ground cover is a concern.	2:95	2:95 Data from the 1991 and 1992 LCTA field studies have been analyzed, and are presented in a new series of figures, 3-1 through 3-4.
<u>Section 3.1.1.4.1</u>		
Change title to: "Small Weapon Ranges Status after Rehabilitation" Need to include an additional subsection entitled "Status Before Rehabilitation" that describes effects prior to rehabilitation.	2:96	2:96 This material was extensively revised, and the topics referred to have been consolidated with other coverage.
Page 3-8, second paragraph, line 8: Need to clarify reference. What is Table 1?	2:97	2:97 This section of the text has been deleted from the FEIS.
Second paragraph, line 12: Sentence beginning with "However", please clarify when.	2:98	2:98 Reference in DEIS was to areas which had been reseeded one or more years prior to observations.
Second paragraph line 17: Delete "excellent"	2:99	2:99 See response to comment 2:98.

Ranges 12, 18, 40, and 41: Need a discussion of conditions after annual training but before rehabilitation and during AT.

Section 3.1.1.4.2

Change title to: "Training Area T-19 Status after Rehabilitation" Need to include an additional subsection entitled "Status Before Rehabilitation" that describes effects prior to rehabilitation.

First paragraph:

Line 4: Replace "populated" with "vegetated".
Line 6: Delete "profound".
Delete last sentence.

Section 3.1.1.4.3

Change title to: "Training Area T-28 Status after Rehabilitation" Need to include an additional subsection entitled "Status Before Rehabilitation" that describes effects prior to rehabilitation.

First paragraph:

Line 1, Replace: "Very well constructed" with "Constructed".
Line 3, Replace: "in excellent condition and well vegetated" with "were seasonally seeded"
Lines 3 & 4, Delete "a thick stand of".

Second paragraph:

Line 2, Delete: "slope"
Line 6, Replace: "obviously doing their job" with "effectively".
Line 8, Replace: "this year" with "in 1991".
Line 9, Delete: "ridge"
Line 11, Delete: "was coming along quite well"

Section 3.1.1.4.4

Change title to: "Tank Assembly Area Status after Rehabilitation" Need to include an additional subsection entitled "Status Before Rehabilitation" that describes effects prior to rehabilitation.

Section 3.1.1.4.7

First paragraph:

Delete fifth sentence: "However, the erosion is not now...."

Sixth sentence, delete "few lightly vegetated" and replace "through excellent" with "by".

Section 3.1.1.4.8

2:100

2:100 See response to comment 2:96.

2:101

2:101 Text at this section of DEIS referred to an area which was not observed by the writer prior to revegetation. See also response to comments 2:96 and 2:97.

2:102

2:102 See response to comments 2:96 and 2:97.

2:103 See response to comment 2:101.

2:104 See response to comment 2:98.

2:105 See response to comments 2:96 and 2:97.

2:106 See response to comments 2:96 and 2:97.

2:107 See response to comments 2:96 and 2:97.

2:108 This section of the text has been deleted from the FEIS.

2:109 This section of the text has been deleted from the FEIS.

2:110 This section of the text has been deleted from the FEIS.

2:111 See response to comments 2:96 and 2:97.

2:112 See response to comments 2:96 and 2:97.

2:113 See response to comment 2:96.

2:114 See response to comment 2:96.

2:115 This section of the text has been deleted from the FEIS.

2:116 The paragraph has been reworded and the comments incorporated into Section 3.1.1.3.2.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

First paragraph, line 6: Replace "steep sloped road there" with "road with steep grades".

Section 3.1.1.5.1

Line 8: Replace "Appendix C-8" with "Appendix C, page C-59" and delete "airborne training".

ADD NEW SECTION

SECTION 3.1.1.7 Fire

The Black Creek Ranger District averaged 90 wildfires which burned over 2900 acres per year for the five year period 1987-91. Of these, 22 or 24%, were military caused and accounted for over 2000 acres or 69% of the acreage burned. Fires within the dedicated impact area and buffer averaged 4.4 fires and 1807 acres. The remaining fires were the result of range 40 activity and other maneuver and bivouac exercises. See Appendix U for an analysis.

Fires occurring outside the dedicated impact area buffer may be fought using direct attack strategy rather than indirect attack. This results in significantly lower acreage burned per fire outside the impact area.

Fires occurring in the Fall are the more serious since critical ground cover is destroyed during the dormant season, leaving the soils exposed to the rains until re-growth in the Spring. Nineteen of the 22 total impact area fires occurred during the period Oct-Feb while 44 of the 89 permit area fires outside the impact area occurred at this time.

Fire intensity is a criteria frequently used to estimate control difficulty and resource damage. The higher the intensity level, the more difficult to control and the more resource damage that occurs. There are six fire intensity levels. Those of 3 and above cause high to extreme resource damage, principally to soil, soil organisms, and small ground dwelling wildlife. 85% of the acres burned were at fire intensity level 3 and above.

Fire danger rating is a combination of environmental factors (temperature, relative humidity, fuel moisture, wind speed, etc.) used to aid in manning and dispatching fire suppression forces. Normally, with similar fuel loads, the higher the fire danger, the higher the fire intensity. There are six fire danger rating categories, A-E and G+, with "A" being no fire danger and "E" being extreme. G+ is normally considered high-moderate and requires changes in manning and tactics. Thirty-two percent of the fires and 38% of the acres burned occurred on G+ and higher days.

Section 3.1.2.1

First paragraph:

Line 3: Replace "Appendix C-8" with "Appendix C, page C-59"
Last sentence: Change "have not" to "have probably not" and replace "measurable" with "significant".

E

2:117

2:117 See response to comment 2:45. This section of the text has been deleted from the FEIS.

2:118 A new section, incorporating the text provided, was added as Section 3.1.1.6.

2:119 Original reference was to appendix C, part 8, rather than to page C-8. Text has been changed.

2:120 Suggested editorial comments have been accepted.

2:118

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

Second paragraph 2, Line 11: Replace "Section 1.1.4" with "Section 3.1.1.4".	2:121	2:121	Comment has been incorporated with Section 3.1.1.3 representing the revised section number.
End of second paragraph add following sentence: "By agreement with the National Guard, the tank maneuver areas are planned to be prescribe burned on a three year schedule."	2:122	2:122	Material covering this concept has been added to Section 3.1.2.1.
Incorporate following into section: "Both the Ragland hills and Loblolly Bay Area are off-limits to motorized vehicles. They are available for foot travel, compass courses, etc."	2:123	2:123	Material has been incorporated in new Section 3.1.2.1.1.
Section 3.1.2.3		2:124	First paragraph Section 3.1.2.3 re-worded.
First paragraph, delete first sentence and replace with following: "The species of economic importance are described in Section 2.4.3. There are 53,332 acres of National Forest land within the permit boundary which is dedicated to military use for tank maneuver, ranger, firing points, etc."		2:125	The section has been reworded.
Second paragraph:		2:126	The comment noted and incorporated into Section 3.1.2.3.
Line 4: Replace "declared off-limits" with "declared off-limits to tracked vehicles".	2:125		The discussion in Section 3.2.1.3 has been modified.
Third sentence: Should state "This area has been set aside for a Gopher Tortoise Refuge and will serve as a study area".	2:126		Forest Service has provided revised text.
Page 3-17, second paragraph:			Forest Service has provided revised text.
Line 9: Replace "ends" with "ended".	E		Forest Service has provided revised text. Section 3.1.2.3 has been revised and the sentence has been deleted from the paragraph.
Delete last sentence. "Normal timber management..."	2:127		Please see coverage of county returns issues at section 3.1.4.3.1.
Page 3-17, fourth paragraph, second sentence: Replace "From Congress to the Washington Office USFS for distribution" with "by Congress to the Forest Service".		2:128	
Page 3-17, last paragraph, delete first sentence.	2:128		
Second sentence - Replace word "First" with "In addition to increasing treasury receipts,".	2:129		
Page 3-18, first paragraph, delete last sentence.	2:130		
ADD A NEW SECTION:			
3.1.2.3.1. County Returns .			
The current tank maneuver areas represent a lost source of revenue to the counties as a result of not contributing to the 25% county return pool. This is estimated to be about \$100,000 annually.		2:131	
CURRENT TANK maneuver AREA OPPORTUNITY COST			
COUNTY			
ANNUAL COST			

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

FORREST	\$9,862
GEORGE	1,749
GREENE	6,610
HARRISON	12,241
JACKSON	3,707
JONES	6,562
PEARL RIVER	758
PERRY	32,230
STONE	8,331
WAYNE	17,951

An additional 24,868 acres are basically cleared for ranges, etc. and also do not contribute to the return pool.

Section 3.1.2.4

Overall, the effects on wildlife (WL) and threatened and endangered (T&E) species are poorly displayed. There is very little quantified comparison of effects on WL and T&E by alternative. This makes it appear that the effects of the proposal on wildlife are not known. A better description of the known effects should be presented.

First paragraph, line 2: Replace "Appendix C-8" with "Appendix C, page C-59"

Second paragraph, line 5: Delete "foot-"

Line 12: Replace "moderate to dense" with "light".

ADD NEW SECTION:

"Section 3.1.2.4.1 Leaf River Wildlife Management Area

Current tank maneuver areas do not impact the area. A small portion adjacent to the McLain Road is available, but seldom used, for bivouac only. Portions of the northern end of the LRWMA are used for various foot and wheeled vehicle exercises. Patrol exercises are carried out during AT along the road network within the LRWMA."

Section 3.1.2.5

Section title, replace "Special Interest" with "Sensitive"

Page 3-19, first paragraph, line 1, replace "reason to believe these" with "information on" and delete "exceed those".

2:132 Comment noted. Quantifying all of the known effects for wildlife is difficult in that little information exists for many of the species, or their sometimes complex interactions. There are many known factors that influence a populations ability to persist in an area, of which only some have been well studied. However, based on the amount of new edge created (by alternative, facility, etc.), and the acreage of each habitat lost (forest stand type & age), an attempt has been made to better differentiate the alternatives quantitatively. In this limited quantification emphasizing songbirds and small mammals, the number of species expected to benefit or suffer as a result of each alternative, etc. is provided. Please see new and revised sections 3.1.2.6, 3.1.2.4, 3.1.2.5, 3.2.3.6, 3.3.2.4, 3.3.2.5, and 3.5.5 through 3.5.7 in the FEIS.

2:133 Original reference was to appendix C, part 8, rather than to page C-8. Text has been changed.

2:134 Text has been revised.

2:135 Text has been modified.

2:136 See new Leaf River Wildlife Management Area Section 3.1.6.

2:137 This text has been revised.

Page 3-19, paragraph 2:

Second line: Replace "should reduce mortality somewhat, as this area" with " , which".

Delete remainder of paragraph beginning with sentence - "In 1990, ..." (This will be replaced by new opinion).

Page 3-19, third paragraph, line 4: Add "foraging" after "woodpecker".

Section 3.1.3.4

Paragraph 1, line 7: Breakup up sentence by inserting a " ." after "activities".

Insert a paragraph on pleasure driving as follows:

"Driving for pleasure, another frequently cited (55% of respondents) recreation activity, peaks in the spring during the dogwood blooming season. The majority of this activity takes place in the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area and is not impacted by current military activities. The weekend tank firing closures limit the use of the area west of highway 29 to weekdays."

Section 3.1.3.5

Add discussion addressing land use conflicts concerning Leaf River Wildlife Management Area.

Section 3.1.4.1.1

First paragraph, line 3: Replace "2-7" with "2-8".

Section 3.1.4.2

First line, replace "42 active" with "32 active".

Second line 2: Replace "42,505 acres" with "31,378 acres".

Third line 3: Replace "Three of" with "Two of".

Line 12: Replace "mineral leasing" with "mineral exploration".

Delete last sentence: "At current prices,"

Section 3.1.4.3

First paragraph, last sentence: Replace "will be opened" with "was opened"

Section 3.2.1.2

Page 3-25: Add discussion of noise on residences, how close to proposed corridors, PTA's, and facilities are they. Address this issue by alternative.

Section 3.2.1.3

2:138 This text has been revised.

2:139 Text has been modified. Preparers note, however, that the provisions of the 1989 Biological Opinion still apply to the present set of training activities, whose effects are examined in this section.

2:140 Material has been added to Section 3.1.3.4.

2:141 Land use conflicts, per se, are few, and a brief discussion has been added.

2:142 Citation has been corrected.

2:143 See added coverage in Section 3.3.5.3.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

Each alternative should identify the estimated amount of soil loss in tons. APPENDIX C of the 1988 EROSION CONTROL PLAN FOR CAMP SHELBY has information for using the Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE). Also each alternative should address estimated sediment based on a sediment delivery ratio. SECTION 3.4 should identify what mitigation procedures will be used to reduce impacts.

First paragraph, line 5: Replace "from 1-10" with "from 1-12".

Page 3-26, first paragraph, line 3: Replace "area #6" with "area #5 and #6".

Line 4: Replace "alternative #3B" with "alternatives #3A and #3B".

Second paragraph: Include explanation on need for six two-week AT periods.

Last sentence: It is our understanding that it is not practical to assemble two battalions for task force maneuvers for a weekend exercise.

Page 3-26, third paragraph: 1) Need to cite the authority for ceasing maneuvers as stated on page 3-124, section 3.5; 2) Identify what constitutes excessive damage that would cease maneuvers. Need to establish guidelines on what percent of an area can be rutted or percent bare soil exposed before training on that area will cease. Different areas need to be grouped that will or can be mitigated on a yearly basis without impacting adjacent areas. For instance, the drop zone due to its gently rolling terrain and easy accessibility, could be impacted more severely than another area that had steeper slopes and not easily accessible to perform the same type mitigation. What percent of an area can have compacted soil? As stated in SECTION 3.5.2.1.1 80% of (soil) saturation is the optimum water content for compaction and detrimental effects of vehicles are greater when the soil is at moisture content near field capacity. Peak compaction occurs at moisture content near the plastic limit, which is about the optimum condition for tillage operations. It is also stated that heavy equipment should not be allowed on loamy or clay soils when the soil moisture exceeds the plastic limit. This section needs to explain the environmental consequences that would occur if maneuvers are not ceased when soils will compact easily. If sediments are moving into a wetland or stream course, at what point will training cease? If maneuvers are ceased because environmental attributes are considered in jeopardy, what impacts would this have on training?

Page 3-26, third paragraph, line 4: Insert "soils" before "index 1-5".
Line 11: Replace "as soon" with "soon"; replace "training season as possible" with "disturbance occurs".

Page 3-31: Acreages in text and tables need to be reexamined and made to agree - particularly those in Chapter 1 and 3 plus explanation as to why they do not agree. Examples found on page 3-34 last of paragraph 3 cannot be reconciled and are not in Table 3-4 - actual comparison or reference cannot be found in document. Tables 3-5 through 3-10 need to be reconciled information in text needs to agree with tables.

2:144

2:144 A new section (3.1.1.3.4) has been added which covers this subject in greater detail.

2:145

2:145 Commentor is correct. Change has been made.

2:146

2:146 The criteria referred to were followed in evaluation of area #6, but could not be followed fully for PTA #5. Text has been modified.

2:147

2:148

2:147 Please see response to comment 2:146.

2:149

2:148 Of the 6 AT periods theoretically available, only 3 are used for mechanized units which conduct tracked vehicle maneuvers.

2:150

2:149 While it is only infrequently performed, two battalions may be assembled on the same weekend for task force training. Platoon or company-level training is more common.

2:151

2:150 The authorization is contained in Clause 42 of the proposed Special Use Permit. See also new material in Section 3.4.3.

2:405

2:151 See added text coverage in Section 3.5.2.1.

2:152

2:405 Extensive additional coverage was provided in Section 3.5.2.1. Based on past usage patterns, somewhat less than half of any training area is expected to be maneuvered upon in any one year.

2:153

2:152 See added text coverage in Section 3.5.2.1.

2:154

2:153 See response to comment 2:150.

2:155

2:154 See response to comment 2:150.

2:156

2:155 The word suggested has been inserted.

2:157

2:156 The text has been revised.

2:157 Every effort has been made to reconcile acreage values throughout the text and tables.

Page 3-31, Table 3-8: Add acres from Table 3-8 to acres shown in unnumbered table in middle of page 3-66 (Section 3.2.1.5.1).	2:158	2:158 The suggested proposed new location has undergone major revisions, and no table exists at that location. See also response to 2:157.
Page 3-32, Table 3-9: The last legend item is not included in chart, i.e., total dollars of improved roads.	2:159	2:159 Old Table 3-13, Page 3-64 has been revised and several of the previous categories have been eliminated.
Page 3-34, paragraph 2, line 10: Change "sleep" to "steep"; "TA5" to "PTA5" and on last line change "TA3" insert "PTA3".	E	2:160 See response to comment 2:21.
Page 3-34, paragraph 3, Clarify first sentence with respect to "multi-company".	2:160	2:161 Text has been revised.
line 11: Replace "good erosion potential and good revegetation" with "low erosion potential and high revegetation".	2:161	2:162 The reference has been corrected.
Page 3-34, last paragraph, line 1: Change "section 1.2" to "Section 1.2.0.2".	2:162	2:163 The suggested change has been incorporated into present Section 3.3.1.3
Page 3-44, paragraph 1, last sentence: Replace "National Forest lands on Camp Shelby" with "local National Forest lands."	2:163	2:164 The suggested requirements do not comply with current DOD policy, which do not allow land which has undergone only partial demilitarization to leave military control. This is a change, made in the late 1980s, to previous practices.
Page 3-44, paragraph 2, add the following to the end of paragraph: "All areas of National Forest land under permit to the National Guard will be cleared of unexploded ordnance before being accepted by the Forest Service for multiple use management. The acreage will be cleared to the extent that the land is safe for "SURFACE USE ONLY". Surface use only is defined as safe for rubber tired vehicles but not safe for ground penetration. Acreage will be clearly marked on the ground and accurate maps prepared and furnished to the Forest Service and a copy filed in the county courthouse as was done by the Corps of Engineers in the 1950's."	2:164	2:165 The total content of former Appendix T has been incorporated into Chapter 3 to accomplish this.
Page 3-44, paragraph 3: Include a synopsis of Appendix T discussing Tank Table VIII in this section.	2:165	2:166 These estimates have been quantified, and appear in Table 3-16.
Page 3-44, paragraph 5, line 10: Need to quantify (define) word "considerable" (cubic cards) providing a range of impacts. How many acres will have to be filled? What is the effect (impact) on the wetlands? Of the 230 acres of wetlands, how many acres will be lost? At beginning of sentence, what does "In addition" reference?	2:166 2:167 2:168 2:169	2:167 The total number of acres of wetlands within the site are reported in Table 3-19. The acres proposed to require fill are presented in Section 3.3.1.5.1. 2:168 See response to comment 2:167.
Page 3-44 and continuing on page 3-57, replace last sentence: "The alternate site has..." with the following: "The alternative site has less moderate to high potential of erosive soils and less low revegetation potential soils, less relief and less wetland areas, but more T&E species habitat." Include reference to gopher tortoise data. The gopher tortoise assessment shows numerous colonies within alternative site and site dropped from further consideration. The disclosure of effects of constructing MPRC-H on the primary site is very weak and does not adequately disclose those effects for decision making.	2:170 2:171	2:169 The words "in addition" in the DEIS referred to the problems stated in the preceding sentence. The problems following were in addition to those just stated. 2:170 See revised text in Section 3.3.2.5.2. 2:171 See response to comments 2:166 and 2:170.
Page 3-56, Figure 3-24: Eliminate "----" in front of RCW colonies and title the star as "Endangered Species - RCW colony" The --- line confuses the figure.	2:172	2:172 Comment noted. The figure has been eliminated.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

2:173 The revisions have been made.

2:174 The revisions have been made.

2:175 The revisions have been made.

2:176 Text has been modified.

2:177 Comment noted.

2:178 See additional discussion in Section 3.3.1.5.

2:179 See response to 2:178.

2:180 The wetland buffer concept has been extensively revised following the public comment period for the DEIS. The safeguards contained in the suggested paragraph are met or exceeded within the present proposal. See also response to 2:178.

2:173

2:174

2:175

2:176

2:177

2:178

2:179

2:180

Page 3-58, paragraph 2, line 5: Delete "at either site"

Page 3-58, paragraph 2, last sentence: Replace "effects on soil loss." with "effects on soil loss and soil compaction."

Page 3-61, Figure 3-27 and also Figure 1-12 on page 1-41: The fourth assembly area needs to be shown in these figures.

Section 3.2.1.4

Second paragraph: Rewrite first sentence to read "The proposed EOD site will be monitored to determine if contaminants are escaping from the site into the ground water (Appendix D)."

Third paragraph, line 5: Change "depending on soil conditions" to "depending on how much soil is on the vehicle".

Section 3.2.1.5

First paragraph, line 6: Replace "33 foot buffer" with "required buffer as specified in FIRM".

Page 3-65, top of page, rewrite remaining portion of section beginning with: "A 33 foot width..." to read as follows: "A 33 to 66 foot minimum filter width should be sufficient for intermittent and perennial streams respectively in areas having gentle slopes. For locations within the proposed training area having steeper slopes, the rule of adding width to the filter will be at a rate of 1.5 times the percent slope to meet FIRM standards. These widths will be monitored to determine their effectiveness."

Section 3.2.1.5.1

Paragraph 2, line 17, starting "As indicated above..." rewrite to read as follows: "The minimum buffer widths required for wetlands are similar to those for intermittent and perennial streams. The buffer strip starts at the edge of the wetland and extends outward. Where wetlands are adjacent to perennial streams, minimum buffer widths for both perennial stream and wetland will be met. The following table illustrates the required minimum buffer widths for intermittent (pitcher plant bog) and perennial (Gum pond) wetlands."

Intermittent Wetland minimum buffer widths									
		% Slope of Sideslope							
		0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35
		40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75
		80	85	90	95	100	105	110	115
		total filter strip width (feet)							
		33	40	45	55	60	70	75	85
		90	100	105	115	120	130	140	150
Perennial Wetland minimum buffer widths									
		% Slope of Sideslope							
		0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35
		40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75
		80	85	90	95	100	105	110	115
		total filter strip width (feet)							
		33	40	45	55	60	70	75	85
		90	100	105	115	120	130	140	150

	66	66	66	70	75	85	90	100	105	115
--	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----

2:180

2:181

2:182

2:183

2:184

2:185

2:186

188

189

061:

192

193

2:182 The paragraph has been revised in Section 3.3.1.5.1.

2-183 Text has been modified to reflect current plans, in which no specific estimate is made of the number of acres so affected. Proposed width is actually 10 meters (33 feet), not 66 feet.

2:184 The table has been eliminated.

2:185 Text has been reworded.

2:186 This section has been replaced.

2:187 Text in Section 3.3.1.5.1 has been reworded.

2:188 This section has been replaced.

2:189 Text has been reworded.

2:190 Text has been reworded.

2:191 The proposed wording has been incorporated.

2:192 See response to comment 2:191. Text modifications reflect intent of the comments.

2:193 Text modifications reflect intent of the comments.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

Page 3-70, Item 2 (MPC-H), last sentence: There is no information in this document that supports this statement.

Page 3-70, item 6 ('AA's'): Place "(page 3-44 and 3-57)" after reference to Section 3.2.1.3 (Section 3.2.1.3 is such a long section that a referenced page number should be listed whenever this section is referenced to avoid confusion in finding answer).

Section 3.2.2.1.1

Page 3-70, first paragraph, add new third sentence: "These areas would be placed on a three year prescribed fire cycle to control the woody understory."

Page 3-71, paragraph 1, line 25: Change "poor soils." to "soils poorly suited for tracked maneuvers."

Page 3-71, paragraph 1, line 29: Change "biological standpoint" to "biological (habitat) standpoint".

Page 3-71, paragraph 2, line 6: Change "poor soils" to "soils poorly suited for tracked maneuvers".

Page 3-72, paragraph 1, line 3: Replace "exact amount" with "estimated amount". On next line change: "alternative #1 is 6,696" to "alternative #1 is estimated to be 6,696".

Page 3-72, Table 3-12, add a column: "Effect on Suitable Land".

Page 3-73, last sentence: Delete "through 3-14".

Page 3-73, Table 3-14: (need a separate table 3-14A showing only Leaf River WMA with columns stating acres thinned acres cleared - no action. Total acres by PTA thinned and cleared.

Proposed table follows:

LEAF RIVER WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA IMPACT TABLE 3-14A

	NUMBER OF ACRES		
	NO ACTION	THINNED	CLEARED TOTAL EFFECTED
PTA 1	2760	2177	1953 6890
PTA 2	7090	3424	2072 12586
PTA 3	0	0	0 0
PTA 4	0	0	0 0
PTA 5	0	0	0 0

2:194

2:195

2:196

2:197

2:198

2:197

2:199

2:200

2:201

2:202

2:194 Text has been revised. The MPRC-H alternative site was dropped from further examination following receipt of the Biological Opinion, and further analysis of landforms and other factors was not pursued.

2:195 Comment noted.

2:196 Change has been incorporated.

2:197 Text has been changed in two places as suggested.

2:198 Section 3.3.2.1.1 has been revised and the item referred to does not appear.

2:199 The change has been made throughout the section.

2:200 Comment noted. Tables 3-21, 3-22, and 3-24 were revised from previous tables when new data became available. The Black Creek Ranger District currently has 173,531 acres of land suitable for timber management.

2:201 The text has been modified and the appropriate figure numbers added into Section 3.3.2.1.1.

2:202 A series of new figures (3-56 through 3-60) have been prepared reflecting the impacts by alternative on LRWMA are presented in new Section 3.3.6.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

PTA 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2:203	Management of the gopher tortoise is covered in section 2.4.5.1.2.
CORR SET 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2:204	See response to comment 2:164.
CORR SET 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2:205	The sentence in Section 3.3.2.1.1 has been rewritten. The topic is now covered in Section 3.3.2.3.1 and Table 3-24.
CORR SET 3	1236	0	2105	3341	0	0	0	0	0	2:206	The suggested material has been added to Section 3.3.2.1.1.
CORR SET 4	1060	0	767	1827	0	0	0	0	0	2:207	The definition in the former Appendix T corresponded to the actual proposed practices. This is now reflected in the text in Section 3.3.2.1.1.
CORR SET 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2:208	Text has been modified.
CORR SET 6	1236	0	2105	3341	0	0	0	0	0		
ALTERNATIVE 1	12,146	5601	7390	25,137	0	0	0	0	0		
ALTERNATIVE 2	12,146	5601	7390	25,137	0	0	0	0	0		
ALTERNATIVE 3A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
ALTERNATIVE 3B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
ALTERNATIVE 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
ALTERNATIVE 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
ALTERNATIVE 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Page 3-74, paragraph 4, after second sentence, ending: "...alternative 4." add new sentence: "Training Area 44 will be managed by the Forest Service to enhance gopher tortoise habitat."										2:203	
Page 3-74, paragraph 4, last sentence rewrite as follows: "Under Alternative 5 the amount of land that would return to the Forest Service for multiple use management is 14,232 acres (Table 3-12)." and add new sentence: "Alternative 6 would return all areas of National Forest lands under permit to multiple use management, once they have been cleared of any unexploded ordnance."										2:205	
Page 3-74, paragraph 5, add to end of first sentence: ", however; an increase in wildfire activity may be expected due to increased usage."										2:204	
Page 3-75, Paragraph 1, sentences addressing impacts to wetlands conflict with information disclosed in Appendix T: "10 acres" instead of "7 acres" of wetlands will be cut; stump heights will be "maximum of 6 inches" instead of "1 foot"; cut timber will be "left to decay naturally" instead of "removed". Note last sentence "protective measures is" should be changed to "mitigation measures are" also add to end of sentence ", if wildfires are effectively controlled."										2:206	
Page 3-75, paragraph 2: Replace "three-eighths of the lanes" with "three of the eight lanes". Make this change as necessary to eliminate the 3/8										2:207	
										2:208	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

reference. Clarify "lasting effects of cutting the timber" in last sentence. Identify and discuss those "lasting effects".

Section 3.2.2.1.2

This section needs to be updated, Mike Hurst, Forest Service Wildlife biologist on the Black Creek Ranger District, can provide specifics.

ADD NEW SECTION on proposed Botanical Areas

Section 3.2.2.1.3 Proposed Botanical Areas

These areas (Lobby Bay and Ragland Hills - Section 2.4.1.1) will continue to be off-limits to motorized vehicles under all proposed alternatives.

Section 3.2.2.3

Page 3-79, third paragraph, last sentence, delete "or 6" and add the following:

"Implementation of Alternative 6 would result in some additional harvests over that in Alternative 5. There are portions of range and impact area buffers which have stands of timber which would become available for harvest. However, no effort was made to calculate these volumes.

Other than Alternative 4, selection of any alternative will require the re-calculation of the long term sustained yield. The following table shows the expected effect on the allowable sale quantity through the next four ten year periods:

Table III Opportunity Volume Cost
(Difference in implementation area and turnaround area when under normal
Forest Service Management)

	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4
	MMBF	MCF	MMBF	MCF
Alt 1	-7.3	-12.5	-16.8	-4.7
2	-5.0	-11.8	-11.1	-7.1
3A	+12.5	+5.1	+16.0	+1.8
3B	-11.7	-1.7	-1.1	-1.8
4	0	0	0	0
5	+18.8	+13.8	+26.5	+17.3
6	1/	1/	1/	1/
	MMBF	MCF	MMBF	MCF
	-19.5	-12.7	-13.5	-12.7
	-7.3	-7.3	-7.5	-7.3
	+13.8	+4.4	+12.6	+13.8
	-1.0	+1.8	-7.6	+1.8
	0	0	0	0
	+34.7	+21.2	+34.5	+34.7
	1/	1/	1/	1/
	MMBF	MCF	MMBF	MCF
	-51.3	-42.1	-51.3	-42.1
	-39.0	-33.7	-39.0	-33.7
	+59.0	+10.3	+59.0	+10.3
	-12.4	-9.3	-12.4	-9.3
	0	0	0	0
	Total	Total	Total	Total

2:209 Text has been modified to incorporate the suggestion.

2:210 Section 3.3.2.1.2 has been modified to reflect changes in the sensitive species list.

2:211 A new section, "Proposed Botanical Areas" was incorporated as Section 3.3.2.1.3 with some variation in wording from that proposed.

2:212 These data have been incorporated into (new) Section 3.3.2.3.1.

+114.5 +65.3
1/ 1/

1/ Not calculated, it more than Alternative 5."

Section 3.2.2.3.1

Page 3-80, first paragraph, include sentence discussing Alternative 4: "Alternative 4, current management, would have no effect on county returns, which presently average \$100,000 annually for the permit area."

Second paragraph, line 9: Explain what "high biodiversity" is. Are these areas of existing or potential "high biodiversity"? What standards are being compared or measured?

Section 3.2.2.4.1

Section should include a statement regarding effects of current activities on species tolerant of activity and a discussion on wildlife during nesting, mating season, ect.

Paragraph 1, sentence 2: Insert after "permanent), and" the following "would result in"

line 6: Delete "unusually".

line 7: After "operations" insert a ", " followed by " lasting only 3-5 years".

line 8: Replace "from a" with " for some", and insert "species" after "wildlife" and delete "viewpoint, however".

line 9: After "snags" insert "(standing dead trees)". After "and" insert "down".

Paragraph 2, last sentence, change "from trail construction activities" to "from construction activities" and split sentence after "with alternatives 1, 2, 3A, 3B" by replacing "and" with "These impacts may ".

Page 3-81, first paragraph, line 3, replace: "better wildlife cover" with "better habitat for some wildlife".
lines 7 and 8, replace "(areas where rare, ...(to end of sentence)..." with (ie: areas where T&E, sensitive, and wetland areas occur)".
last line, replace: "adequate avenues" with "some avenues".

Page 3-81, paragraph 3, line 8, replace: "These apparent reductions" with "The reduction".
end of paragraph 3, it should be noted that: Redwing blackbirds and starling are considered nuisance species and often have to be controlled through animal damage control techniques. They have been known to congregate in large numbers resulting in significant health risk and have been known to keep more desirable species out of an area.

Page 3-82, first paragraph, line 2, replace "The results these three studies suggest" with "These three studies suggest".

Section 3.2.2.4.2

28

64

2:212

2:213 Since the effects of Alternative 4 are essentially the same as those of the present activities, this effect is discussed in Section 3.1.4.3.1.

2:214 The discussion of biodiversity in Section 3.3.2.4.1 has been revised.

2:213

2:215 This section has been revised to reflect the changes in the timber thinning/clearing proposal described in the DEIS. While current impacts are discussed in Section 3.1, and a more comprehensive discussion of the effects of military disturbance (noise) on wildlife is in section 3.1.5.4, in order to reduce redundancy a statement was added to section 3.2.2.4.1 referring to the discussion of the effects of noise on wildlife.

2:214

2:215 The suggested change has been incorporated into Section 3.3.2.4.1.

2:216

2:217 The word "unusually" has been deleted from the sentence in Section 3.3.2.4.1.

2:217

2:218 The suggested wording has been added to Section 3.3.2.4.1.

2:218

2:219 The text has been revised.

2:219

2:220 Comment noted. The section does not appear in the FEIS.

E

2:221 The text has been modified.

E

2:222 Comment noted. Red-winged blackbirds and european starlings tend to exhibit the flocking behavior more often than many of the other species on Camp Shelby, and under certain circumstances does have the potential of becoming a public health risk. But while the red-winged blackbird is frequently labeled a pest species, it is indigenous to the long-leaf pine ecosystem and has evolved concurrently with the other members of the ecological community. Displacement of one native bird species (or individual) by another in the wild is a frequent but natural event (interspecific competition). It is agreed, however, that sustaining artificially high populations of red-winged blackbirds in an area and then creating avenues for their dispersal into previously contiguous stands of forest could have detrimental effects on some of the other species in those areas.

2:220

2:221

2:222

E

Page 3-84, under item 5: Include a discussion for both options (1) and (2).
Page 3-84, under Item 6, paragraph 1: Should include effects of noise and wildlife refer to Section 2.3.2.2 (that was earlier suggested it be moved to Chapter 3).

ADD NEW SECTION

Section 3.2.2.4.3 Leaf River Wildlife Management Area

"Alternatives 3A, 3B, 4, 5, and 6 would have no effect on the 41,780 acre LWMA. Alternatives 1 and 2 would have a significant impact."

	NUMBER OF ACRES				TOTAL EFFECTED
	NO ACTION	THINNED	CLEARED		
ALTERNATIVE 1	12,146	5601	7390		25,137
ALTERNATIVE 2	12,146	5601	7390		25,137
ALTERNATIVE 3A	0	0	0	0	0
ALTERNATIVE 3B	0	0	0	0	0
ALTERNATIVE 4	0	0	0	0	0
ALTERNATIVE 5	0	0	0	0	0
ALTERNATIVE 6	0	0	0	0	0

Although approximately one-half the area is slated for no action, these areas are dispersed as narrow drainageways, adjacent lowlands, and islands of upland gopher tortoise habitat. The majority of the timber on the uplands would be removed with the scattered hardwoods remaining. Virtually all ridges would become a terraced grassland of erosion control planted annuals with intervening perennial shrubs and grasses. The general forested character of the area would disappear and permanent movement of some animals would occur. Increased access can be expected to lower the quality of the hunting experience. Increased hunter success should result as hunting occurs over more open land with limited expanses of escape cover."

Section 3.2.2.5

Change "Special Interest" in section title to "Sensitive".

Section 3.2.2.5.1

Paragraph 1, Delete first sentence, change second sentence as follows: delete "In addition, "; replace "on its lands" with "on National Forest lands"; on next line delete "proposed" and change "and sensitive" to "or sensitive".

- 2:223 The two options for the CALFEX areas as originally described in the DEIS are no longer being considered.
- 2:224 The discussion was revised to include a reference to the effects of noise on wildlife.
- 2:406 Section 3.3.6 contains (new) Figures 3-56 through 3-60 which contain much of the information provided.
- 2:225 Text has been modified.

2:406

E

2:225

Section 3.2.2.5.2

Item 1, Paragraph 1: First sentence change "(Table 3-23)" to "(Figure 3-23)". Delete third sentence: "A biological evaluation of the proposed..." this BE is no longer valid.

Item 2, paragraph 1, add to end: "Fish and Wildlife Service consultation and subsequent biological opinion will direct activities relating to this conflict."

Item 2, paragraph 2: How many make up "relatively large"? With reference to gopher tortoise.

ADD NEW SECTION

Section 3.2.2.5.3 Impacts to Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species by Alternative

Need a discussion about impacts on TE&S species by alternative (under a separate heading).

Section 3.2.2.6

The impacts to wildlife and threatened and endangered species appear to be very subjective and are not clearly displayed to compare alternatives. Impacts, especially to threatened and endangered species, need to be carefully evaluated and the results disclosed in the EIS to insure compliance with current USFWS Biological Opinions and requirements of the Endangered Species Act.

Page 3-87 through 3-91, move references to TE&S and the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area to the new sections 3.2.2.5.3 and 3.2.2.6.1 respectively.

Page 3-87, item 1, paragraph 1, sentence 2: "Potential impacts to wildlife..." change to read as follows: "Potential impacts to wildlife would be greater in Alternative one than any other simply due to the size of the area involved."

Page 3-87, last paragraph, line 2: Replace "the growth of" with "existing".

Page 3-87, last paragraph, line 7: Insert " , for a few years" after "many species".

Page 3-87, last paragraph, line 9, Insert "as" after "cleared areas " .

Page 3-88, paragraph 1, first line: Replace "typical in thinning operations." with "option."

Page 3-88, paragraph 2, line 2: Replace "military and civilian communities" with "public".

Page 3-88, paragraph 3: Insert the following as a second sentence "The Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks has information on the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area that would provide good trend analysis for the area."

2:226 Comment noted; this paragraph has been revised.

2:227 Text has been modified to reflect the concern.

2:228 A discussion of the impacts by alternative with respect to TE&S species has been added as Section 3.2.5.3. The two gopher tortoise colonies referred to total 33 active burrows.

2:407 Section 3.2.5.2 and 3.2.5.3 examine potential effects on TE&S species by facility project and by alternative, respectively.

2:229 See response to comment 2:132.

2:230 This section has been revised to emphasize non T&E species, which are covered in section 3.2.2.5.3. Although a separate section was created concerning the LRWMA, continued reference to the topic in section 3.2.2.6 is appropriate as wildlife do not recognize many human delineated boundaries.

2:231 Text has been modified.

2:232 Text has been modified.

2:233 Concept referred to has been removed from the FEIS.

2:234 See response to 2:233.

2:235 See response to 2:233.

2:236 Comment noted. Preparers believe the original wording is more reflective of the exact meaning intended. In our practice, the term "public" usually excludes military personnel and dependents.

2:237 Comment noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

Page 3-89, paragraph 2, line 11: "Figure 3-10" should be "Figure 3-9".	2:238	2:238	Comment noted. Referenced paragraph has been revised.
Page 3-89, paragraph 3, line 4: Reference to "section 3.4.4.1" does not address specific impacts to wildlife.	2:239	2:239	The correct reference was to section 3.2.2.4.2 (DEIS), now 3.3.2.4.2 (FEIS).
Page 3-89, Paragraph 4, line 2: "Figure 1-8" should be "Figure 1-9".	2:240	2:240	The citation of figure number has been corrected and incorporated into Section 3.3.2.4.3.
Page 3-90, paragraph 1, line 2: "(TA-5, TA-4, and 3)" should be "FTA-1, FTA-2, and FTA-3".	E		
Page 3-90, paragraph 2, Item 3: Replace "sub-option" with "alternative" where it occurs (four places).	E		Commentor is correct. Change has been made.
Page 3-91, Item 6, line 1: Change "alternative (1)" to "alternative (6)". Delete text for second sentence through the end of paragraph. Current text is not an accurate description of the impacts associated with alternative 6.	2:241	2:241	Within the Army and National Guard structure, closure is a given following selection of Alternative 6, in which no permit would be issued for military use of any Forest Service lands. Please see Section 1.2.9 for a discussion of why operation of schools without field training was rejected. In addition, it is not economically feasible to operate facilities such as the waste water treatment plant, water wells, and other utilities for the small number of students attending Camp Shelby schools on an intermittent basis (155 of the 700 are employed by the schools).
Section 3.2.3.2			
Closure is not a given, it is just one of several possibilities. How many of the 700 people would lose employment or relocate if ranges and tank maneuvers were closed but cantonment area schools were left open?	2:242		
Section 3.2.3.3			
Paragraph 2, line 4: Replace "archeological resources" with "cultural resources".	E		Please see the discussion of recreation availability in new Section 3.3.3.4.
Section 3.2.3.4			
Describe effects on recreation availability by alternative and make a comparison to the no action alternative (Alternative 6).	2:243	2:243	At one time, it was believed possible that maneuvers might require engagement across Highway 29, rather than just convoy crossings. Under present plans, only convoy crossing will be necessary at any time. With Alternatives 1 and 2, such crossings will be only slightly more frequent than at present. With Alternatives 3A and 3B, crossings will be more frequent than under Alternatives 1 and 2, but will still be limited to 10 minute events.
Paragraph 1: Include an explanation for why Highway 29 may be closed for several days.	2:244	2:244	
Page 3-93, line 4, start a new paragraph with sentence beginning "Under Alternative 5..."	2:245	2:245	Section referred to has been rewritten.
Page 3-93, add the following paragraphs to the section: "Driving for pleasure would be most severely impacted by alternatives 1 and 2 which will have most of the roadides east of highway 29 in corridors or training areas. The character of the area would change from a timbered environment interspersed with openings to a large opening interspersed with islands of timber and timbered drains and lower slopes. Alternative 3A and 3B would effect it to a lesser extent since the areas effected would be west of Highway 29. The areas in these alternatives which are east of the highway are either already cleared or are inaccessible. Alternatives 4 and	2:246	2:246	Text in this section has been revised to reflect the concepts in commentor's proposed material.

5 would show no change from the present. Alternative 6 would open up the area west of highway 29 to unrestricted use.

The opportunity for developing hiking, horseback, and ATV trails will be restricted. There has been interest in an ATV trail on the northern portion of the permit area. Implementation of Alternative 3A or 3B would severely limit any proposed location. None of the other alternatives would affect this proposal. A horseback trail has been proposed for the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area. Alternatives 1 and 2 would preclude this use since it would follow ridges and established roads and be utilized in the summer. None of the other alternatives would effect this proposal."

ADD NEW SECTION

Section 3.2.3.5 Mississippi Highway 29 Closure

Develop a new section dealing with Highway 29 closure and associated impacts.

Section 3.2.4.1

Need a discussion about where food and other supplies to support the troops are coming from and what it amounts to on an annual basis.

Section 3.2.4.2

First paragraph, line 2, replace: "timber removal," with "timber removal for the Camp Shelby permit area,"

Page 3-94: Include a paragraph that explains the volumes used in the Volume Summary table: "1/4 Period Turnback Volume - Volume to be harvested over 40 years if current maneuver areas outside proposed maneuver areas were under regular National Forest management. 2/4 Period Lost Volume - Volume which could be harvested over 40 years from proposed maneuver areas if they were under regular National Forest management. 3/Period 1 Implementation Volume - Volume to be cut to implement alternative."

Section 3.3.1

Page 3-95, last paragraph, third sentence, "LCTA methodologies..." rewrite as follows: "LCTA methodologies (Tozik et al., 1991) will provide data on vegetative, wildlife (small-mammal and songbird in particular), and land-use information will be gathered on an annual basis." Delete "(derived from.....resource personnel".

Page 3-95, last paragraph, line 18: Replace "manage its wildlife" with "manage wildlife".

Section 3.3.2

First paragraph, line 1, replace: "an excellent program" with "a program"; line 5, replace "all disturbed" with "most disturbed"; last sentence should

2:247 See response to comment 2:244. See discussion of this issue in the Quality of Life sections 3.1.3 and 3.5.8.

2:248 In Section 3.1.4.1.1 of the FEIS, an estimated annual value of approximately \$16 million is given for the value of locally procured services and supplies. This value is utilized in calculating the impact of Camp Shelby on the local economy.

2:249 A new section, 3.3.2.3.1, has been developed which presents the material requested.

2:250 Text has been modified.

2:251 The section referred to has been rewritten.

2:246

2:247

2:248

E

2:249

2:250

E

2:251

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

be moved toward front of document to page 3-5, second paragraph, as its second sentence.	2:251	2:252 The correct table number, now Table 2-4, has been incorporated into Section 3.3.2.
Paragraph 2, last line: "Table 2.1" should be "Table 2.3".	2:252	
Paragraph 3, line 6, replace: "those of as" with "those as"	E	2:253 The sentence pertaining to the 1991 survey has been modified as requested, and incorporated into Section 3.3.2. and Table 3-11.
Paragraph 3, last sentence, replace with: "The 1991 survey covered only undisturbed sites within the subject area."	2:253	2:254 Comment noted. This section has been rewritten.
Fourth paragraph: This paragraph implies that a thick sod is maintained or replaced after training. The reference cited [Baver, et. al. (1972)] is based on mollusks. The soils and climate for the areas cited in the reference, do not represent Camp Shelby. Areas seeded after active duty training in August will not establish a sod because the majority of the areas seeded will be disturbed in the next training season.	2:254	2:255 Water quality and wetlands consequences are examined in Section 3.3.1.5.
What impacts will the fine soil materials (tables 3-18 & 19) that are not filtered have on water quality, stream channel configuration, or down stream users? How many tons of sediment does this represent for each alternative?	2:255 2:256	2:256 A new section has been added, 3.3.1.4, in which the quantities of soil lost under each alternative are examined.
		2:257 Comment noted. The paragraph no longer exists in the document.
Section 3.3.3		2:258 Comment noted. This material has been replaced for the FEIS.
First paragraph, line 4: Replace "endangered" with "threatened and endangered and sensitive".	E	2:259 Comment noted. Revised coverage of this section responds to the commentor's questions. Identification of exact measure is part of the site-specific development plan.
Page 3-99, last paragraph, drop paragraph to bottom of page, line 5: Replace "habitat" with "colony sites".	2:257	
Table 3-16, Page 3-99: Columns 3 and 4 do not total up.	2:258	2:260 New Section 3.4.2 provides this information.
Section 3.4		
This section needs to identify what kind of mitigation is to take place to reduce impacts identified in SECTION 3.2 and 3.5. ITAM is a process not a measure. How many tons of soil loss will be reduced using mitigation measures? What types of mitigation will be used during the active training periods (not just what is done in August after training)? Discuss mitigation by ceasing maneuvers. Will soil compaction be mitigated by subsoiling? How often - every 5 years, 10 years, etc.? How are filter strips going to be maintained so they will function properly year after year.	2:259 2:260 2:261 2:262 2:263 2:264	2:261 Management of erosion "hot spots" during the training season is discussed in new Section 3.4.3.1. 2:262 This avoidance measure is a part of the training area soil damage flow chart, Section 3.4.3, Volume 1, of the FEIS. 2:263 Subsoiling is not now contemplated as a routine measure.
Paragraph 1: Rewrite paragraph as follows: "These measures are in addition to those now used at Camp Shelby. They are specifically designed and planned to alleviate the problems resulting from implementing the proposed action."	2:265	2:264 Filter strips are self-maintaining to a large degree, as the perennial grasses continue to grow from year to year. Should accumulation of deposited materials build to the point that vegetation growth is not possible, the area may be regraded and revegetated.
Section 3.4.1		2:265 Comment noted. Preparers believe the original wording is a fair statement of the intent.
Place paragraph on "TRI" before paragraph on "EA" to be consistent with order presented in first paragraph of this section.	2:266	2:266 This section has been extensively revised.

Section 3.4.3.2

Page 3-104, Table 3-18: Are these real or actual values?

Page 3-105, paragraph 4: "Alternative methods of erosion control..." This needs to be extensively expanded since vegetative buffers are not effective sediment catchers. A large % of the PTA's and corridors will need these treatments.

Section 3.4.3.3

Page 105, last paragraph, change: "Figure 3-30" to "Figures 3-31, 3-32 and 3-33".

Figure 3-30, page 3-106. Include numerical dimension of the crossings.

Page 3-107, paragraph 3, delete last sentence: "A nearby source..."

Page 3-107, Paragraph 4, line 2, replace: "will always be under water for" with "will be under water for some period of time for perennial and intermittent".

Page 3-107, paragraph 6, rewrite first sentence to read: "The U.S. Forest Service has had success with temporary at-grade crossings and using confinement grids."

Section 3.4.4

First paragraph, line 1, delete "excellent"; line 2, replace: "lands" with "areas".

Section 3.4.4.2

Monitoring should be broken down by alternative.

The whole monitoring section needs to be re-evaluated. This section needs to identify: 1) the resources to be monitored; 2) the intent of the monitoring activity; 3) monitoring techniques and data sources; 4) sample size, frequency of measurement, and expected precision/reliability; and 5) the variability which would indicate further action.

The discussion in paragraphs 2 and 3 are adequate for alternative 5 only.

USGS has a hydrologic bench-mark station (02479155) located on Cypress Creek near Janice, MS. Since this station samples part of the drainage area for the proposed actions, it should be included as a data set.

Page 3-114, Figure 3-34 shows six monitoring stations, of which only the first four are setup for installation.

Section 3.4.4.3

First paragraph, line 2: What determines "acceptable"?

2:267 The table is no longer included in Section 3.4.5.2. However, the information has been revised and is referred to in the text.

2:268 Sections 3.4.2, 3.4.4 and 3.4.5 of the FEIS assume that the sites for numerous small structures will be identified through application of the erosion/deposition model and that their design and construction will be a systematic part of the detailed site analysis and engineering design process as the new training areas are developed.

2:269 The correct figure number is now Figure 3-58A.

2:270 The figure (now Figure 3-63A) illustrates a concept, and is not rigorously dimensional. The stated dimensions of a crossing give a 16 ft (5 meter) minimum width for the improved surface (Section 1.2.1.3).

2:271 Preparers agree. Sentence referred, in the original source document, to economic feasibility, which is not an issue here.

2:272 A change has been made which reflects the commentor's thought.

2:273 Text has been modified.

2:274 Comment noted. The erosion control program covers all lands, and is not restricted to the maneuver areas.

2:275 Comment noted.

2:276 Comment noted.

2:277 Comment noted.

2:278 Comment noted.

2:279 Comment noted.

2:280 In the context of this usage, "acceptable" implies that the training areas remain available for realistic training use, and that vegetative cover and other measures of quality are maintained and do not show a decreasing trend.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

Page 3-116, paragraph 3, third sentence: What are you trying to say?	2:281	2:281	Text has been modified.
Page 3-116, paragraph 4, last sentence, replace: "purposes" with "and maintenance program".	2:282	2:282	Modification suggested has been made.
Section 3.4.4.4			
The text in this section would be more appropriate in Appendix G (ITAM). It does not "fit" in Chapter 3, as written.	2:283	2:283	Comment noted. Much of the material referred to has been removed from the FEIS.
Page 3-117, under Item 3, line 3: What are "burning grounds"?	2:284	2:284	See response to comment 2:283. The text in the DEIS was a generalized discussion, and the "burning grounds" mentioned are not found on Camp Shelby. A burning ground is an area where combustible wastes were (in past practice) were repeatedly burned on the surface of the soil.
Page 3-119, Item #4, line 6: replace "Recent air" with "Recent aerial".	2:285	2:285	Comment noted.
Page 3-119, Item 4: What is the information source for Perry County?	2:286	2:286	
Section 3.4.6			
Page 3-122, paragraph 2 and 3, rewrite following the new Biological Opinion of the USFWL concerning the gopher tortoise?	2:287	2:287	The procedure described was a generalized description of proposed actions in ideal circumstances. Forest Service soil survey data were substituted for SCS data where no complete SCS mapping was available.
Section 3.4.7			
First paragraph, last sentence, change: "Forest status" to "Forest management".	E		This section has been revised to reflect the spirit of the 1992 biological opinion.
ADD NEW SECTION:			
Section 3.4.8 Fire			
"There are several mitigation measures which may be taken to reduce the impact to soils and wildlife from high intensity wildfires. They may be separated into the following categories:			
1. Ranges and impact areas.			
Limit firing during periods of C+ fire danger and above, or provide a helicopter with water drop capability on stand-by.			
Establish fire breaks/green strips within ranges and impact areas.			
2. General permit area.			
As part of ITAM, include wildfire prevention education as it pertains to military operations.			
Advise troop commanders when fire danger reaches C+.			
Advise troop commanders of appropriate actions to take, based on fire danger, in the event of a wildfire.			
Limit use of incendiary devices during periods of high fire danger, class D and above."			
	2:288	2:288	New Section 3.4.9.1 incorporates the information proposed by commentor.

Section 3.5

We do not agree with the statements presented in paragraphs two through four of this section.

Section 3.5 Cumulative Effects on the Environment (Section 3.5.1 through 3.5.9.2) does not fully disclose all cumulative effects associated with the actions being proposed for implementation. There are cumulative effects which can not be fully mitigated; soil erosion, compaction and siltation, timber removal, and wildlife habitat will all have some measurable cumulative effect. The proposed mitigation measures will not totally eliminate the impacts to the human environment. Such impacts should be disclosed. The cumulative effects should be measured against the "no action" alternative (Alternative 6).

The amount (% of area) of soil compaction should be estimated for each training area and corridor set by alternative. How much will occur the first year and what additional amount for say the next 10 years? What cumulative effect will this have on the amount of surface water runoff? Would increased stream flows have an effect on water quality, stream channel configuration, or down stream users?

Need to explain what affect repeated soil loss will have over time. Where is the soil loss going? If it is being trapped in filter strips, what is the cumulative impact on the filter strip? If a percent is in the form of sediment, what effect over time will continual sedimentation have on water quality, stream channel configuration, or down stream users?

Page 3-124, paragraph 2, sentence 1: Need a reference that explains (supports conclusion of) this sentence. "A one-time maneuver....". Reference research study or any other study that will support this statement. Cumulative effects can not be compared to FS management practices, since nothing the FS does equates to the magnitude of soil disturbance for a given area that is being repeated on a yearly basis.

Page 3-125, paragraph 1, line 5 & 6. insert ". " after years. Delete "and occasionally when soils are critically wet." and insert "Training will not occur when soil is critically wet".

Page 3-125, insert a new second paragraph as follows: "The cumulative effects to soils and wildlife of additional wildfires occurring on the new proposed HPRG-II range can be mitigated to some extent if the recommendations in sec 3.4.8 are followed. They can't, however, be eliminated as some areas will burn on an annual basis adding to the area of land which has no humus layer nor organic matter."

Section 3.5.1

Paragraph 1. Assessment based upon existing conditions as of today.

Paragraph 2, sentences 2, replace: "to maintain or improve all wetland vegetation, T&S species habitat" with "to maintain and protect wetland vegetation improve T&E species habitat."

2:290

2:289 Comment noted. This section has been completely revised to incorporate the ideas expressed by the commentor. The preparers believe comparison to the "status quo" (Alternative 4) is more reasonable.

2:290 Comment noted.

2:291 The sections referred to have been extensively revised and extensive new material added in response to the issues raised by the commentor.

2:292 See response to comment 2:291.

2:293 See response to comment 2:291.

2:294 See response to comment 2:291.

2:295 See response to comment 2:291.

2:296 See response to comment 2:291.

2:297 See response to comment 2:291.

2:298 Comment noted. The text cited in the DEIS has been revised, but did distinguish between one-time and recurring events.

2:299 The text referenced has been extensively revised.

2:300 The text referenced has been extensively revised.

2:301 See new paragraph in Section 3.5

2:302 Comment noted. The comparison is with existing conditions.

2:302

E

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

Paragraph 2, lines 9 & 10, delete: "easily" and "with only minimal effort"	2:303	2:303	The text has been modified.
Paragraph 2, last sentence, replace: "but these areas are relatively small" with "without decontamination".	2:304	2:304	Text has been modified to clarify our original meaning.
<u>Section 3.5.2</u>			
Need to include a discussion of results from the soil loss tables.	2:305	2:305	A new summary table has been prepared and discussion of this topic has been added.
Page 3-126, paragraph 1: Need evidence of studies based on research to support these conclusions.	2:306	2:306	Text has been modified.
<u>Section 3.5.2.1</u>			
Paragraph 1, line 3, replace: "dangers" with "impacts"	2:307	2:307	Text has been modified.
<u>Section 3.5.2.1.1</u>			
Section on Compaction needs further work. Potential for significant cumulative impacts from compaction are great. This needs to be analyzed carefully in the EIS. Nowhere in the document is a discussion on the effect of READINESS LEVELS from not maneuvering due to wet soils during the AF period. What is the effect of substituting firing and simulation, this must be addressed.	2:308	2:308	Comment noted. Some cumulative effects of compaction are acknowledged, and discussion of them has been carried throughout the document.
Page 3-127, paragraph 2: Erbach study does not relate to the Shelby area and should be dropped.	2:309	2:309	See response to comment 2:150. The effect on readiness cannot be projected except to note that failure to execute an Annual Training event may result, effectively, in a one-year setback of a unit's schedule. Commanders must have a well planned alternate training plan in the event that scheduled training has to be changed, but such a substitution cannot fully compensate in most cases for the missed exercise.
Page 3-127, paragraph 5, line 6, replace: "little occurs" with "little additional compaction occurs".	2:310	2:310	The use of simulators provides valuable training in preparation for gunnery and tactical operations. As effective as this training may be, it is not a substitute for, but a preparation for, the actual training.
<u>Section 3.5.2.1.2</u>			
First paragraph, line 2, replace: "wet lands" with "wet soils"; line 5: delete "if at all possible"; line 6, replace "are too wet" with "are at or beyond the plastic limit."	2:311	2:311	Preparers believe the study referenced is relevant, although not based on conditions identical to those at Camp Shelby. Text has been modified to reflect this relationship.
<u>Section 3.5.3</u>			
Need a better discussion on cumulative effects on wetlands.	2:312	2:312	Text has been modified.
Last sentence: Explain "improve". How will ITAM improve the water quality and integrity of the wetland areas?	2:313	2:313	Text has been modified.
<u>Section 3.5.3.1</u>			
Please explain and reference back to Section 3.1.1.5.1, page 3-12.	2:314	2:314	Text has been modified.
<u>Section 3.5.4</u>			
Page 3-129 and 3-130: delete paragraph beginning: "Putting large volumes of un-regulated timber....in all of these program areas."	2:315	2:315	Text has been modified.
	2:316	2:316	Text has been modified.
	2:317	2:317	Word has been deleted.
	2:318	2:318	Text has been modified.
	2:319	2:319	Paragraph moved to Section 3.3.2.3.

Section 3.5.4.1

Delete reference (Kochenderfer et al., 1990) and find a reference that is more applicable for the type actions proposed. Provide a more complete disclosure of the anticipated cumulative effects.

Section 3.5.4.2

Change section title to: "Wildfire and Prescribed Fire".

Findings in the Vegetative Management FEIS referenced should be briefly discussed and summarized here.

Section 3.5.5

Page 3-131, paragraph 1, line 6, replace: "the action alternatives will favor" with "the alternatives will result in some habitat favoring"; line 8, insert "(neotropical migratory birds)"; line 9, delete "probably"; line 10, insert a "." after "plan"; line 11, replace: "will result" with "will help offset the negative cumulative effects in the long term effects".

Page 3-131, paragraph 2, line 3, replace: "communities is well" with "communities and is well"; line 12, add "some" after "of"; line 13, insert a "." after "species" and add the following sentence: "We can expect more species requiring edge and more disturbance tolerance species". line 18, insert a "." after "requirements" and delete: "in order to maintain regional biodiversity".

Page 3-131, paragraph 3: Delete entire paragraph and rewrite, make comparison to National Forest management, "no action" alternative (6). How is biodiversity being measured. It is hard to believe that activities associated with large scale tank maneuvers will increase biodiversity over normal forestry practices including prescribed burnings that have been a natural part of this ecosystem for a very long period of time.

Section 3.5.6

Paragraph 1, line 5: insert a "." after "Shelby"; line 6, delete "even though" and begin sentence: "Suitable habitat..."; line 8, insert a "." after "alternative"; line 10, delete "be".

Paragraph 4, Add the following sentence at the end of paragraph: "The effects of proposed activities on all federally listed species on National Forest lands must be disclosed and documented. The USFWS will have the responsibility of providing the Biological Opinion that addresses the impacts of a project on a listed species".

Section 3.5.7

2:320	Comment noted.	2:320
2:321	Extensive material has been added which responds to the spirit of this request.	2:321
2:322	Text has been modified.	2:322
2:323	Text has been modified.	2:323
2:324	Comment noted.	2:324
2:325	Text has been modified.	2:325
2:326	Text has been modified.	2:326
2:327	Text has been modified.	2:327
2:328	The rewording requested has been made.	2:328
2:329	Comment noted. This topic has been moved to Section 3.5.7, and completely revised. The sentence pertaining to the comment no longer appears in the revised material.	2:329
2:330	Comment noted. See also response to 2:329.	2:330
2:331	Comment noted. See also response to 2:329. We do not expect many more additional edge species, but rather, more individuals of edge species already known to occur.	2:331
2:332	Comment noted. See also response to 2:329.	2:332
2:333	This entire section has been revised based on the concerns and recommendations of the COB.	2:333
2:334	See the response to comment 2:333.	2:334
2:335	Changes have been incorporated.	2:335
2:336	Comment noted. The paragraph has been reworded in response to the issues raised by this comment.	2:336

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

Add the following paragraph: "The cumulative effects on potential recreation development is to concentrate the opportunity for development on a smaller area of National Forest land. The effect is greater for Alternative 1 and 2 because the area selected for expansion of tank maneuvers has the best potential for recreational development that is other than hunting related. The effect for Alternative 3A and 3B is less because the area and intensity of development for tank maneuvers is less."

What would happen under Alternative 5 & 6 verses Alternative 2 & 4?

Section 3.5.8

First paragraph, last sentence: "Nothing proposed by the Army..." Need a statement concerning mixture of public use and tank training with respect to public roads.

Second paragraph: Additional 28 weekends has not been agreed to.

Section 3.5.9.1

Page 3-134, paragraph 2: Explain last sentence.

Need another paragraph that discusses the effects on the economy.

Section 3.5.9.2

Page 135, paragraph 3, last sentence, replace: "Table 3-11" with "Table 3-12"

Section 3.6

Add the following paragraph:

"Recreational Opportunity - Development of the proposed training areas and inter-connecting corridors will result in the irretrievable loss of the opportunity to develop various trail systems and associated facilities within the affected area. Thus the selection of any of the action alternatives, 1 through 3B, will preclude any development for recreation, but to varying degrees between alternatives."

Add section on soil losses incurred by tank training areas and corridors laying fallow for 1-6 months until the erosion control work is completed.

Loss of timber production in cleared areas is an irretrievable loss during the time the area is cleared of trees.

Section 4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The entire section needs to be rewritten. Current text reflects a very cursory review of findings that should be disclosed more thoroughly. Address all the effects as pointed out in Section 3.2 Proposed Status.

Section 4.1.1.1

- 2:337 The concept expressed has been incorporated in Section 3.5.11 where this effect is now discussed.
- 2:338 See response to comment 2:337. New material has been added which discusses the effects of Alternatives 5 and 6.
- 2:339 Comment noted. Because the intent of the preferred alternative is to provide an area in which Battalion Task Force Maneuver Training can be conducted. These will be large scale maneuvers conducted over a large area under simulated combat conditions. Obviously, the potential for injury exists. Camp Shelby has developed procedures which emphasize public safety, as discussed in Section 3.5.8.1.
- 2:340 Comment noted. The material referred to does not appear in the FEIS. The use of "28 weekends" in the DEIS referred to actual past usage, not specifically to an proposed situation.
- 2:341 Since Alternatives 1 through 5 would all include some construction activity, a very small, but positive, employment effect is projected due to this added work availability.
- 2:342 The section on economic effects has been rearranged and expanded.
- 2:343 The entire section has been revised and moved to Section 3.5.10.2.
- 2:344 Comment noted. Preparers suggest that, while the desirability of the experience may be reduced, this does not represent an irretrievable loss. See also the response to comment 2:337.
- 2:345 Comment noted. Soil loss through the full annual training and rehabilitation cycle has been modeled, and does acknowledge some loss in this interval. See Section 3.3.1.4 and Table 3-20. This modeling has assumed that repair of training areas is on a continuous cycle following cessation of training up to the projected November completion date.
- 2:346 Comment noted. Deferral of production of a renewable resource is not normally considered an irretrievable loss in this context.
- 2:347 Comment noted. This entire section has undergone major revisions.

Alternative #1, line 1, replace: "possible" with "realized"; line 3, delete "potential for possible"; line 4, insert "soil compaction," after "load"; line 5, delete sentence: "However,"	2:348 2:349 2:350 2:351	See response to comment 2:347. See response to comment 2:347.
Alternative #2, line 4, insert "soil compaction" after "load"; line 5, delete sentence: "Again, the areas...."	2:350 2:352	See response to comment 2:347.
Alternative #3A, delete last two sentences: "This alternative...."	2:353	See response to comment 2:347.
Alternative #3B, line 3, insert "soil compaction" after "load".	2:350	See response to comment 2:347.
Alternative #4, line 1, delete "excellent"; and delete last sentence: "With the full...."	2:354 2:355	See response to comment 2:347.
Page 4-2, Alternative #6: Include discussion of local economic effects.	2:356	See response to comment 2:347.
<u>Section 4.1.1.2</u>		
Results of additional analysis required in Section 3.2.1.3 should be discussed here.	2:357	See response to comment 2:347.
First paragraph. (Punk Table VIII), Moving 165,000 cubic yards of earth would have significant effects if not mitigated. This is not mentioned.	2:358	See response to comment 2:347.
Page 4-2, paragraph 2, (HPRG-H), line 1, delete: "no"; delete second sentence: "Mitigation will be...."; line 4: delete "no"; line 5, and place a "." after "site", delete "however" and begin a new sentence.	2:359 2:360 2:361 2:362	See response to comment 2:347. See response to comment 2:347. See response to comment 2:347.
Page 4-3, paragraph 2: Sentence 1 needs to be rewritten.	2:363	See response to comment 2:347.
<u>Section 4.1.2</u>		
Rewrite this section for clarification. It should cover, item by item, the effects which can not be mitigated -- how much sediment will escape, etc.	2:364	See response to comment 2:347.
<u>Section 4.1.3</u>		
TEES: Mitigation isn't considered positive when compared to status quo. What are "progressive mitigation measures"? Should read "habitat management measures" instead. This section will need additional write-up following the new biological opinion for the gopher tortoise.	2:365	Comment noted. This scoring has been completely revised, and has incorporated the commentator's suggestions while doing so.
Page 4-4, Table 4-1: Write up should state origin of table - was Table 3-1 on page 3-2 used in conjunction with unnumbered table on page 3-66 and Table 3-14 on page 3-73? If so, the rating for 3B is too severe in comparison with Alternative 1 & 2 since far less acres are being cleared and far less acres of wetland are impacted. Standard to measure against should be Alternative 6. Rankings don't reflect the write-ups in Section 3-2. Disparity in title for soils (overall) in this table and soils (general) in Table 3-1. The titles should be the same. How will the	2:366 2:367 2:368 2:369 2:370	Comment noted. This table has been extensively revised, and supplemented with written discussion of the effects and rationale behind the scores presented. See response to comment 2:289. Comment noted. Section 4.1.3 has been completely rewritten to explain how the values for the seven alternatives were derived for the different environmental topics.

2:369 See response to 2:368.

2:370 Comment noted. It is predicted that many small improvements in areas such as this are expected
to result from improved management procedures and better separation of threatened species habitat
from heavily-used maneuver areas.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

proposed action alternatives have a positive on threatened and endangered plant and animal species in the short term?	2:370	2:371	Based on the Camp Shelby EIS Biodiversity Conflict Resolution Committee's (COB) definition of biodiversity (Section 1.2.1.4.3), the impacts to wildlife, wildlife habitat, and T&E species were re-evaluated for the FEIS. The text in the appropriate sections of the document were then revised based on the COB's more ecologically acceptable definition. As this definition was infinitely more complex than that presented on the DEIS, the re-assessment of impacts and net effects to wildlife and T&E species provided in the FEIS could also be expected to differ dramatically. For example, the net cumulative effect on biodiversity for Alternative 1 consequently changed from a "+" in the DEIS to a "-" in the FEIS.
Page 4-5, Table 4-2: What supports the conclusions reached that, -the alternatives, in the long-term, will have beneficial or neutral effects not only to threatened and endangered plant and animal species, but also to wildlife habitat, small and big game species and biodiversity? Current documentation does not provide adequate information to reach these conclusions.	2:371		
Page 4-6, Soils (overall): Need a discussion or evaluation of cleared/exposed area and compaction in tank trails and maneuver area in comparing with Alternative 5 and 6. Need to discuss the soil losses from bare soil for 1-6 months until erosion control measures are completed. This would be brought forward from the additional discussion in Section 3.1.1.4, 3.2.1.3, 3.5.2, and 3.6.	2:372		
Page 4-6, Soil Erosion Losses, second sentence: "Therefore, soil loss will be minimal..." comparison should be made to Alternative 6 the "No Action" alternative, not alternative 4.	2:373		
Page 4-7, Noise: Add the discussion on tank maneuver noise on residences to this section.	2:374		
Page 4-7, Wetland (loss), first sentence: Loss should be measured in actual acres not as a percentage (% shown is incorrect would actually be 0.4%; 4 acres per thousand is not negligible). Second sentence: The only mitigation for loss is replacement. There will be additional minor losses, over time and this should be brought out. Discuss the cumulative effects using maximum numbers and compare by alternative.	2:375		
Page 4-7, Ground Cover, last line: "little change from current status"; What is current status? Comparison should be to "no action alternative", Alternative 6. Need a sentence on the amount of ground which will be void of ground cover for 1-6 months as erosion control is implemented.	2:376		
Page 4-7, TEAS Plants	2:377		
Comment: The Forest Service disagrees with the TEAS paragraph, page 4-7, as it is written in the Draft. We do not understand how a positive effect can be expected if it is already admitted that some wetlands will be lost and some siltation of some of these wetlands may occur.	2:378		
Replace section with the following: "Proposed alternatives should not adversely effect any threatened, endangered or sensitive (T.E or S) plant species, as most of the sensitive flora occurs in wetland areas which are to be protected from direct disturbance. As more information becomes available regarding TE or S plant species in the future, continued mitigations will help protect them and their habitats."	2:379		
Page 4-7, Forestry (timber supply), last sentence, delete phrase beginning "when the timber age".	2:380		
	2:381		
	2:382		
	2:383		
	2:372	2:372	See response to 2:345
	2:373	2:373	See response to 2:345
	2:374	2:374	See response to comment 2:289.
	2:375	2:375	This coverage has been added as requested.
	2:376	2:376	Comments are noted. As discussed elsewhere, even 0.4% is probably less than the original measurement error, which is often an order of magnitude greater than this value.
	2:377	2:377	Comment noted. We believe there will be gains as well as losses in the long term, as wetland communities are allowed to expand.
	2:378	2:378	Comment noted. In accordance with appropriate regulations covering NEPA examinations, the values used are those believed most representative. Use of the maximum number possible for each alternative is not believed to be a credible set of circumstances.
	2:379	2:379	See response to comment 3:347
	2:380	2:380	See response to comment 2:289.
	2:381	2:381	See response to comment 2:372.
	2:382	2:382	Comment noted. See response to comment 3:347.
	2:383	2:383	Section 4.1.3.1.7 has been rewritten, and the phrase referred to does not appear..

Page 4-7, Wildlife Habitat -

Comment: (In the first sentence, referral to construction disturbance is mentioned and the subject is habitat. The disruptive and disturbance aspects from construction and military training are intrinsic factors and very pertinent. They should be discussed under a separate heading. Also, when referring to actions being beneficial to wildlife, that needs to be qualified. The carrying capacity for edge dependent species and some early successional dependent species will increase under the action alternatives. However, if this is mentioned, you must state that late successional dependent wildlife, such as interior species, will lose some habitat.)

Page 4-8, Small and Big Game: Clarify what is meant by last sentence. If permanent edge isn't as beneficial or is detrimental compared to rotating edge then it should be so stated.

Page 4-8, TEGS Animals

Comment: (Mitigations do not automatically have a positive effect on TEG species. Please explain this in more detail or remove this sentence.)

Page 4-8, Biodiversity -

Comment: (Biodiversity is not defined in this document. Please refer to recent, published literature for a qualifying statement. Also, describe biodiversity at a regional basis or delete that statement.)

Need definition to appear in the glossary and then use this definition throughout the document. There is a Forest Service manual definition which is similar to that defined in "landscape linkages and biodiversity" edited by Wendy Hudson or in "biodiversity" edited by E. O. Wilson.

Replace subsection writeup with the following:

"Prior to actual implementation, Camp Shelby will perform more detailed, site specific environmental analysis, confirming the presence or absence of any threatened, endangered or sensitive species in each of the areas proposed to be modified. Each land management unit will be characterized in terms of indigenous species diversity. Various habitats and geographically separate zones will be characterized as either well represented, moderately represented or poorly represented in terms of species diversity. The Army ITAN program will assist in identification and plans for long-term protection of habitats such as riparian zones, pitcher plant bogs, marshes and other significant and sensitive habitats. This will help to ensure that adequate regional habitat requirements continue to exist.

Long-term benefits to edge dependent and early successional habitat preferring wildlife in terms of habitat available are expected to some degree with all but the no action alternative (Table 4-2). One notable benefit to wildlife will be the creation of islands of forest adjacent to wetlands and riparian and sensitive areas within the proposed maneuver areas. Many of these islands, some of which include native longleaf pine,

2:384

2:384 This section has been revised in the Final EIS to reflect changes in the proposals (e.g., timber clearing and training area boundaries). Secondly, the Wildlife Habitat category has been merged into the Biodiversity category. This was done because changes in habitat result in changes to biodiversity and changes in biodiversity are often attributed to habitat alterations. A new topic (Construction Disturbance) has been added to the Table 4-1 which addresses this intrinsic factor.

2:385

2:385 Comment noted. See also response to 2:384.

2:386

2:386 Comment noted. See response to 2:347.

2:387 See response to comment 2:370.

2:387

2:388 An interagency Committee on Biodiversity was formed in response to comments on this issue. The definition developed by this committee is presented in Section 1.2.1.4.3 of the Final EIS. See also the response to 1:9.

2:388

2:389 See response to 2:388.

2:390 Comment noted. See also response to 2:347.

2:389

2:390

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Forest Service (Kenneth Johnson)

will be off limits to tracked vehicle use, and will provide some cover for wildlife. These will be left in addition to the other designated sensitive species."

Page 4-8, Wood Products Industry, Reference tables in Section 3.2.2.3, page 3-78 rather than Table 4-1 and 4-2 since this section is an explanation of 4-1 & 4-2.

Section 4.2

Second sentence needs to spell out the Department of the Army current mission statement for the National Guard.

Section 7:

Move John White into Section A. Primary Contributors To The EIS.

Volume II, Appendices

Add Memorandum of Understanding to Appendix A.

Appendix A-2:

Page A-2-2, Clause 26, line 1, replace: "enforce" with "ensure".

Page A-2-5, Clause 35, line 1, replace: "No charge will be made for this use." with "The fee for use is waived as authorized in 36 CFR 251.57(b)."

Appendix E: What is the difference between the Lavender and the Camp Shelby Crayfish?

Appendix H, page H-1, paragraph 3: "(average = 0.0031)" should be "(average = 0.00031)".

Appendix K, Page K-10, last paragraph: Incomplete, portion of appendix missing.

Appendix L: Biological Opinion #1 need to be more specific (when Opinion was issued and what it was issued for).

Appendix Q: Need origins of list and include listing of common names.

Appendix R, page R-2: Interpretation Guide to Climate Diagram is not applicable to this document.

Appendix T, page T-16, Section T.3.2.1.3, line 15, replace: "an existing" with "a restored".

Appendix T, page T-17, Section T.3.2.1.6, paragraph 1, line 8, replace: "an existing" with "a restored".

2:390 The appropriate tables in Section 3.3 have been referenced.

2:391 See response to comment 2:6.

2:393 Comment noted. Change has been made.

2:394 The Master Agreement (which we believe to have been intended by the commentor) has been included in Appendix A.

2:395 Text reproduced was provided by USFS on diskette. Any proposed changes will be negotiated between the parties to the agreement.

2:396 See response to comment 2:395.

2:397 See response to comment 1:22. Camp Shelby burrowing crayfish (*Fallicambarus gordonii*), unlike the lavender burrowing crayfish (*F. byersi*), are restricted to bogs dominated by pitcher plants (*Sarracenia* spp.), and thus far appear to be endemic to the Camp Shelby area. In addition, there are significant morphological (structural) differences between the two species (J. Fitzpatrick, personal comm.).

2:398 The value in Appendix H has been changed from 0.0031 to 0.00031.

2:399 The incomplete portion of Appendix K has been corrected.

2:400 Comment noted. All relevant Biological Opinions are reproduced in Appendix L.

2:401 Comment noted. The origins of the lists were inadvertently omitted, but have been included in the FEIS. Many of the entries on these lists were based on original field work that was conducted specifically for the FEIS, and have been marked with an asterisk (*). The entire plant list represents new field identifications which were a part of the LCTA process. Common names are provided for the vertebrate animal species.

2:402 Comment noted.

2:403 The entire content of Appendix T of the DEIS has been incorporated into appropriate sections of Chapters 1 through 4 of the FEIS.

2:404 See response to 2:403.



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Office of Environmental Affairs
Richard B. Russell Federal Building
75 Spring Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303



RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Department of the Interior (James Lee)

Responses begin on following page

FEB 28 1992

ER 91/1122

Colonel Michael F. Thuss
Mobile District, Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001

Dear Colonel Thuss:

The Department has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Military Training Use of National Forest Lands, Camp Shelby, Mississippi and has the following comments.

General Comments

The draft statement describes the effects of past, present, and proposed future military training activities on 134,000 acres in south central Mississippi, of which approximately 117,000 acres are in DeSoto National Forest. A U.S. Forest Service (FS) Special Use Permit (SUP) allows military activities on FS lands provided those uses are consistent with FS objectives and are conducted under conditions that protect the public interest. The remaining Camp Shelby lands consist of about 7,200 acres owned by the Army, approximately 1,000 acres of private land leased to the Army, and 7,900 acres which belong to the State of Mississippi. The EIS discusses six alternatives for the continuation and expansion of military training at Camp Shelby.

The Army's preferred alternative (No. 1) is to continue training and construct certain new facilities and expand tank maneuvering (for the Battalion Task Force level) into 39,772 acres of FS lands, of which approximately 20,000 acres are in the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area (WMA). The WMA is managed under a cooperative agreement between the FS and the Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks. Tank maneuvering expansion for Alternative 1 would require the clearing of 10,229 forested acres in the training areas (TA's), 3,876 acres cleared in the corridors that would connect the three TA's, and 7,112 acres thinned in the TA's. Thus, if Alternative 1 is implemented, 21,217 acres of the proposed 39,772-acre maneuver area would be cleared or thinned, of which the vast majority is 60-year-old longleaf pine forest. Alternative 1 would also involve turning back 10,809 acres presently used by Camp Shelby but no longer needed to the FS for management. Finally, the preferred plan would involve leaving islands of forest in the maneuver areas up to 50 acres in size with some used for concealment and training and some left undisturbed as off limits.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF U.S. Department of the Interior (James Lee)

- 3:1** Comment noted. Preparers believe the coverage, especially that in the Final EIS, is representative and adequate.
- 3:2** Extensive coverage of the issues raised has been added to the Final EIS (Sections 2.4.4.3, 3.3.2.4, 4.1.3.1.4, and Appendix Q).
- 3:3** Comment noted. The breeding season is a particularly sensitive period for many species. The effects of noise on wildlife are addressed in section 3.1.5.4. Habituation to disturbance varies greatly among individuals and species. An interagency committee was formed to examine the issue of working definition for biodiversity. This Camp Shelby EIS Biodiversity Conflict Resolution Committee's (COB) definition of biodiversity is found in Section 1.2.1.4.3 of the Final EIS. Based on this revised definition, impacts to wildlife, wildlife habitat, and T&E species were re-evaluated for the FEIS. The text in the appropriate sections of the document were then revised based on the COB's more ecologically acceptable definition. Much of this revised discussion appears in the several biodiversity sections (3.1.2.6, 3.3.2.6, and 3.5.7. See also the response to comments 1:9 and 2:371).
- 3:4** Comment noted. Following the interagency Committee On Biodiversity recommendations, the issue of forest clearing (fragmentation) has been re-investigated and conclusions completely revised. Please also see Section 1.2.1.3.1 and the response to comments 1:9, 1:11, and 1:12.
- 3:5** Comment noted. New material has been added which covers the topics raised. See new Sections 2.6.2, 3.1.4.2 and 3.3.4.2 and Figure 2-12. The impact area has been dedicated to its present purpose for decades, and is acknowledged (Section 3.3.4.2) to represent an area in which it is impractical to explore or extract. The tank main gun safety fan has been in place when required for 15 years, but activity is certainly possible at other times. These land uses do not represent new proposals.
- 3:6** In response to commentor's request, contact was made with the permittee, State Oil and Gas Board, Bureau of Land Management, State Geological Bureau and Mr Weatherford (co-author of the Camp Shelby Facilities EIS). None of these sources was able to provide any additional information regarding an estimate of recoverable reserves from the Camp Shelby Field. Thus we are unable to provide a quantitative analysis of the recoverable reserves.
- 3:7** The gas pipelines were identified and taken into account when proposed tracked vehicle maneuver areas were being planned. The only pipeline extending through any proposed maneuver area is operated by Florida Gas Transmission, and is mentioned in Section 2.6.2 of the Final EIS. The companies named by the commentor operate pipelines which underlie less than 5 acres of the permit area. These acres are not proposed for tracked vehicle maneuver use.
- 3:8** See response to comment 3:6.

- 3:1** The document attempts to cover a complex, multifaceted range of military needs and environmental impacts at Camp Shelby. Unfortunately, the draft statement is inadequate and incorrect with respect to its discussion of adverse impacts to forested habitat and wildlife resources. There is no discussion of the adverse impacts of clearing and thinning large forested areas to neotropical migrants (birds that winter in Central and South America and nest in North America). The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has management and enforcement responsibility for these migrants. The document states that the clearing and thinning of thousands of acres of forest for implementation of the preferred plan would actually benefit edge wildlife species. This is not necessarily true, as the intensive tank maneuvering and associated activities from May through August would disrupt and negatively impact courtship, breeding, and rearing patterns of most wildlife species in addition to the destruction of vegetated habitat. One other example of an incorrect conclusion concerns the discussions that, since islands of timber would be left deliberately under Alternative 1, forest fragmentation would be minimized. Leaving islands of forest and clearing or thinning the remaining forest is fragmentation.
- 3:2**
- 3:3**
- 3:4** Mineral resources are discussed in the statement under "Affected Environment" (page 2-17) and in the "Environmental Consequences" section (page 3-24). If the areas are utilized for National Guard training, the document states (page 3-24) that: "... dedicated military use areas may not, in practical terms, be available for exploration. The impact area and active safety fans are thus effectively excluded from usable mineral leasing." The document notes there are 42 active mineral leases in the Camp Shelby permit area inside the FS lands. Pools in three leases (totaling 3,963 acres) are yielding oil and gas. One lease (totaling 621 acres) was apparently drill-tested in 1991 for sulfur but has not yet been completely evaluated. Sand and gravel is not commercially produced in the area, although the area contains borrow pits for local road construction. Lignite occurs as thin beds at depths of 2,000 feet and, as the document states, are not likely to be developed in the near future.
- 3:5** Currently producing wells and the sulfur test wells are not shown on a map, and the locations of these wells versus that of the impact area and the safety fan area are not apparent. Because the two areas essentially are proposed for de facto mineral withdrawal, the relationship between the mineral resource locations and the military use areas is important for an analysis of significant impacts. Additionally, although the value of the remaining affected oil and gas reserves is qualitatively estimated as "low", that value is not quantified, and the source of that qualitative evaluation ("Weatherford McDade, 1988") does not appear in the draft statement bibliography. Several natural gas pipelines cross the area but do not appear to be mentioned in the document. They include those operated by Tennessee Gas Transmission Company and United Gas Pipe Line Company (Pennwell Pipeline Maps; USGS topographic map coverage for the area).
- 3:6**
- 3:7**
- 3:5** We recommend forthcoming environmental documents include maps of currently producing wells in the impact area and the safety fan, two areas apparently being considered for de facto mineral withdrawal for military training. A cost estimate of the value of remaining oil and natural gas resources in the areas should also appear. Factual basis for the estimate should be discussed and the source for the estimate should be one whose credentials are stated in
- 3:8**

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Department of the Interior (James Lee)

- 3:9 In late 1991, U.S. Borax Company was issued a Federal prospecting permit for sulfur exploration on the De Soto National Forest. The company drilled on the flanks of the Cypress Creek Salt Dome located in the Camp Shelby tank maneuver area. The Camp Shelby Training Area is under special use permit to the Mississippi National Guard. Two shallow holes were drilled into the cap rock to determine whether the sulfur content contained commercial quantities for extraction. After examining core samples, the company determined that the cap rock did not contain sufficient quantity of sulfur to pursue a commercial operation. The area was reclaimed satisfactorily.
- 3:10 See response to comment 3:7. It was assumed that improved crossings would be prepared at those points where armored vehicles were allowed to cross the pipelines. The exact location of such crossings is a part of the follow-on site engineering analysis of proposed tracked vehicle maneuver areas, as described in Section 1.4 of the EIS.
- 3:11 The commentator is correct, and exactly this course of action is examined in Section 1.4 of both the Draft and Final EIS.
- 3:12 Comments are noted. As stated in the document, no changes are proposed which are not believed to be substantially capable of reversal within 20 years or so. We have chosen to call this short-term in the context of forest management, although it is understood that others may have differing definitions. Please see additional coverage in Sections 3.3.1.5, 3.3.2.4, and 3.3.2.6.
- 3:13 Comment noted. This effect was recognized in the Draft EIS and expanded in the Final EIS. Please see Sections 3.4.2 and 3.4.5.
- 3:14 Comment noted. Please see the response to comments 3:3, 1:9, 1:11, and 1:12.
- 3:15 Comment noted. The present proposal incorporates a combination of a 100 foot buffer plus structural measures such as water bars, sediment basins, and diversion terraces where they are required for more complete control. See Section 3.4.5 of the Final EIS.
- 3:16 Proposed mitigation measures are presented in the Final EIS. At this stage, exact proposals are not possible because exact acreages are not known, nor can relative value be determined until the site engineering studies are completed. The potential mitigation for the loss of wetlands is discussed in Section 3.4.5.6.
- 3:17 Forest islands are not part of any current proposal. See response to comments 3:4, 1:9 and 1:11.

- 3:8 the draft statement or are well known (such as the Mississippi Bureau of Geology). The fate of the sulfur test drilling program if the areas are used for military training should be discussed; i.e., will continued exploration drilling or future development of the resource be possible? Comments regarding the effects (if any) of the planned military maneuvers on existing pipelines also should be discussed.
- 3:9 Finally, it is important to understand that this draft statement describes a general concept of the various alternatives for military activities. While the document contains specific estimates of the acres that would be impacted with each alternative, the precise locations of, for example, a tank corridor have not been field surveyed and laid out on the ground. Thus, if an alternative involving an expansion of tank maneuvering is implemented, extensive field inspections and biological evaluations would be required prior to project construction.
- 3:10 Specific Comments
- 3:11 Page ES-8, Para. 2. It is stated that the preferred alternative (the expansion of maneuvering into 39,772 acres) has some potential for short-term disturbance to forests, wetlands, wildlife, and so on. The clearing and/or thinning of 21,217 acres of forest would result in long-term, significant adverse environmental impacts to the forest environment. Continuing to the next page, although erosion control measures would lessen sedimentation, they would not prevent adverse impacts to aquatic fauna. Further, the statement that the alternatives involving large scale clearing and thinning of the forest would slightly increase biodiversity is incorrect. Biodiversity is the maintenance of native flora and fauna, which is the opposite of what would occur with the expansion of tank maneuvering. Highly disturbed cleared areas result in an increase in human tolerant, opportunistic species such as starlings, mice, coyotes, and opossums and (as envisioned in this case) the total loss or severe decline of interior forest species including the wood thrush, Chuck-will's widow, various warblers, bobcat, and gray fox.
- 3:12 Page 3-64, Para. 3.2.1.5. The Service does not believe a 33-foot vegetated buffer strip is sufficient to control sedimentation in water bodies and recommends, as discussed in the document, the implementation of the 100-foot buffer zone.
- 3:13 Page 3-66, Para. 2. No mitigation for the net loss of from 4 to 59 acres of wetlands associated with various alternatives is proposed because the loss is so small. We recommend that the final document include a wetland mitigation plan for all alternatives.
- 3:14 Page 3-71, Para. 1. The Service commends the military for the conceptual approach to the development of off limit areas which include endangered species, wetlands, and very erodible soils. However, we disagree with the discussion in the remainder of the paragraph that leaving 50-acre forest islands would reduce forest fragmentation, as clearing and thinning forests is fragmentation. In addition, the statement that from a biological standpoint the forest islands are desirable for many reasons including wildlife habitat and woody plant community health is not documented and is incorrect. Squeezing wildlife into islands of habitat results in stress, artificial

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF U.S. Department of the Interior (James Lee)

3:18 Comment noted. It is agreed that there will likely be additional stress placed on those trees at the new forest edge, and a discussion has been added to the FEIS. See also response to comment 3:4.

3:19 Comment noted. It should not be assumed that every habitat is always at its carrying capacity for each species. The discussion in Section 3.3.2.4.1 references studies which conclude that avian or small mammal biomass may be reduced without reduction in the number of species observed. The effect of timber removal on wildlife has been re-examined based on the new boundaries and on the formalized concept of biodiversity (Section 1.2.1.4.3). See sections 3.1.2.4 through 3.1.2.6, 3.3.2.4 through 3.3.2.6, and 3.5.5 through 3.5.7 in the FEIS for further discussions.

3:20 Comment noted. Fresh tree tops will provide immediate cover and perching sites for a variety of animals. We concur that many more organisms will benefit as the debris begins to break down.

3:21 Comment noted. We must note that many of the maneuver areas will be most intensively used from 6 to 10 weeks between May and August, and only infrequently disturbed for the remainder of the year. Species deemed tolerant should adapt to this activity easily. Section 3.3.2.4.1 has been revised to qualify the original statement.

3:22 Comment noted. Discussion of tracked vehicle maneuver impacts to the larger forest species such as bobcat and black bear, have been addressed in more depth in sections 3.1.2 and 3.3.2 of the FEIS.

3:23 Comment noted. Based on the COB's recommendations on biodiversity issues, the impacts associated with clearing 100 acres have been re-assessed and are discussed in greater detail in sections 3.1.2, 3.3.2, and 3.5. The mitigation coverage you cite in the DEIS has also been revised.

3:24 Comment noted. It is acknowledged that there will be some losses of certain types of wildlife habitat associated with all alternatives. The action does not propose compensation for these losses beyond the mitigation measures proposed in Section 3.4. Please see response to comment 3:16.

3:25 Please see the response to comment 3:3. Species richness frequently does increase as result of disturbance to relatively homogeneous stands of vegetation. However, this potential increase is from edge and early successional species. Since biodiversity is no longer being defined as simply species richness, the known impacts had to be re-assessed and the conclusions revised as necessary (Section 3.5.7)

3:26 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 2:347.

3:27 Comment noted. The USFWS considered the effects of present and proposed military activities at Camp Shelby on the gopher tortoise in their 1992 biological opinion. The Service concurred with the 1992 biological assessment which stated that any action alternative could be implemented (except 3B) without significant adverse impacts to the tortoise. (See Appendix L) The service also concurred with the assessment in that joint management (Camp Shelby and the USFS) "...have no doubt greatly increased the prospects for long term survival and recovery of the western population."

competition for food and shelter, and death. Furthermore, changes in climate and wind patterns following fragmentation of a forest actually stress the remaining islands of woody vegetation.

Page 3-80, Para. 3.2.2.4.1. It is correct that timber removal and earth moving would result in impacts to wildlife. What is not explained is that these impacts would be significant, long-term, adverse impacts to wildlife resources. The theory that resident wildlife would be "displaced" to other areas contradicts basic principles of wildlife management. Wildlife forced to adjacent areas encounter habitat that is already at carrying capacity. Animals inhabit all suitable areas at any given time. The discussion of positive wildlife values of snags and woody debris is referring to the insects and habitats provided by decaying woody vegetation and not the fresh tree tops left from a timber harvest. Finally, to state that species tolerant of human activity and disturbed habitat will return in a short time is a broad assumption that would not apply in some cases based on the proposed level of tank maneuvering for Alternatives 1-3A and 3B.

Page 3-81, Paras. 3.4. This is a good discussion of study results at other military installations concerning the adverse impacts of intensive tank training on woodland mammals and birds. These impacts, as well as tank maneuvering impacts to larger forest species such as the bobcat, should be discussed in the Executive Summary.

Page 3-82, Para. 3.2.2.4.2. Throughout this Section on Specific Impacts to Wildlife from Proposed Facilities, there are statements like the clearing of 100 acres and the construction of new roads for the Automated Tank Table are minor impacts to wildlife and all wildlife impacts are insignificant with mitigation. The Service considers the impacts such as the clearing of 100 acres to be significant and adverse; furthermore, the mitigation later described in the Section Proposed Mitigation Procedures is inadequate, since it only describes avoidance and rectifying soil erosion impacts. Other than the statement that certain unneeded lands would be turned back to the FS, there are no discussions in the mitigation section for the restoration and/or compensation of unavoidable impacts to wetlands and other wildlife habitat for any of the proposed facilities. The final statement should include a mitigation plan for all proposed activities.

Page 3-131. Several statements on this page, including the determination of no net negative cumulative effects to interior forest species and an increase in wildlife species as a result of military training activities in even-aged stands, are not true and should be corrected in the final statement.

Page 4-1. This Section, Conclusions and Recommendations, contains numerous incorrect statements which should be corrected in the final document, including as follows:

- a. "Threatened and endangered species will be worked around or relocated and no remaining effect is anticipated." Military activities will affect endangered species regardless of all efforts. With respect to the threatened gopher tortoise, *Gopherus polyphemus*, the Service has recommended that the military enter formal consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Formal consultation may also be necessary

- for the Red-cockaded woodpecker, *Picoides borealis*, an endangered species. This determination can be made after the FS delineates Habitat Management Areas, as proposed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Management of the Red-cockaded Woodpecker in the Southern Region (not yet released). This process must be accomplished prior to approval at the proposed project.
- 3:28 It is agreed that the issue of Section 7 consultation over the Red-cockaded Woodpecker cannot be resolved until that Final EIS has been filed and a Record of Decision issued. Please also see the response to comments 3:27, 1:2 and 1:3.
- 3:29 Comment noted. Since the DEIS was published, many of the Proposed Training Areas (PTAs), corridor, and facility boundaries have been changed in addition to new data becoming available. Therefore, the conclusions in Table 4-1 (and most other tables) have since been reviewed, and revised if necessary. The discussion referred to has been extensively supplemented in the Final EIS. The short term positive indications for TE&S species referred to improvements in management, and it is felt that better management and protection slightly outweigh loss of unoccupied (non-priority) habitat with respect to the tortoise.
- 3:30 See response to Comment 3:29. Table 4-2, the environmental impacts with mitigation actions for the long-term, has been completely revised and the explanations as to how the values were derived is explained in Sections 4.1.3.1.1 through 4.1.3.1.4.
- 3:31 Comment noted. It is not clear that populations of the most-sought game species will decrease, should the preferred alternative be selected. Please see also Sections 3.5.11 and 3.5.12 and the response to comment 3:21.
- 3:32 Comment noted. With the exception of loss of wetlands, the term mitigation has been used throughout this document in the sense of minimization, avoidance, or reduction of effect, and not in the sense of offering compensation for the value of a damaged resource. See Sections 3.4.5 and 4.1.2.
- 3:33 Comment noted. Preparers note that the areas proposed to be cleared or thinned for maneuver use are only about half the values mentioned in the comment, and that the return of acreage to National Forest management was never considered to be mitigation, per se. The revised text will include a conceptual mitigation plan. Please also see responses to comments 3:16 and 3:24 and the additional coverage in Sections 3.3 and 3.5 of the Final EIS.
- 3:34 Comment noted. Additional coverage has been added which addresses mitigation for wetlands losses. Please also see Sections 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 of the Final EIS.


Summary Comments

The draft statement for continued and expanded military training at Camp Shelby is inadequate in its discussions of adverse impacts to forested habitat and wildlife resources. The turnback of 10,809 acres of unneeded land to the FS as mitigation for the clearing, thinning, and training use of 39,772 acres of national forest (the preferred alternative) is inadequate. Long-term, adverse environmental impacts would occur if Alternative 1 is implemented, as proposed. An adequate mitigation plan including compensation for unavoidable adverse impacts for the preferred plan should be developed.

In conclusion, we have serious reservations about the environmental acceptability of the project as proposed. Therefore, if the final statement does not incorporate adequate mitigation for fish and wildlife resource losses, the Department of the Interior will consider the proposal a candidate for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality pursuant to 40 CFR 1504.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this statement.

Sincerely yours,


James H. Lee
Regional Environmental Officer



STATE OF MISSISSIPPI
Department of Wildlife,
Fisheries and Parks

RAY MABUS
Governor

December 12, 1991

Mr. N. D. McClure
Inland Environment Section
Mobile District Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001

RE: BMR-C 9210138-G, Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)
Camp Shelby, Mississippi

Dear Mr. McClure:

The Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks/Bureau of Marine Resources has reviewed the above referenced project. Based on this review, we believe that environmental impacts to the coastal area resulting from the issuance of the Special Use Permit are limited.

We are pleased that the Department of the Army (DA) will take appropriate measures to minimize soil erosion in maneuver areas and will avoid areas containing rare and endangered species. We would encourage the Department of the Army to maximize their efforts to prevent non-point source pollution of wetlands and waterways draining into the coastal area.

In view of the importance of recreational hunting and the ecological importance of the DeSoto National Forest to coastal residents, we recommend that the Forest Service and DA actively seek replacement hunting lands in coastal Mississippi to compensate for lands impacted by the issuance of the Special Use Permit.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and if you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please feel free to contact our office.

Sincerely,

Philip L. Lewis
Chief, Coastal Management

PLL:GJC

cc: Senator Trent Lott
Congressman Gene Taylor

2620 Beach Boulevard, Biloxi, MS 39531, (601) 385-5860

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mississippi Bureau of Marine Fisheries (Philip Lewis)

4:1 Comment noted.

4:2 Comment noted. Extensive additional material and analyses which examine soil erosion and protective measures have been prepared which are included in the Final EIS. See Sections 3.1.1.3.4, 3.3.1.4, and 3.4.4 of the Final EIS.

4:3 The importance of the De Soto National Forest to recreational hunting is recognized by the MSARNG and the USFS. No area is proposed to be withdrawn from hunting availability. Tank maneuvering will not normally be conducted during the deer (with dog) season, a provision which has been in place for many years. As discussed in Section 3.2.4, the habitat modifications proposed should benefit deer populations. Should training activities of other types occur during hunting seasons in the proposed maneuver areas, access to the public will not be restricted. Please also see response to comment 3:31.

4:1

4:2

4:3



United States Department of the Interior
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

900 Clay Street, Room 235
Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180
March 10, 1992

Mr. Tom Craven
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
CESAM-PD-EI
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001


Dear Mr. Craven:

This concerns the Mississippi National Guard's draft EIS for the proposed expansion of tank maneuvering at Camp Shelby, Mississippi. Our agency recently provided our comments on the proposal to the Department of the Interior for inclusion in their response to the National Guard. Following submission of our comments, it was brought to our attention that Dr. Frank Moore, University of Southern Mississippi, is under contract with the U.S. Forest Service to study neotropical migrant birds within the DeSoto National Forest. His study includes the area proposed for expanded tank maneuvering.

Dr. Moore's study is not related to the tank maneuvering proposal. However, since very little data is available on the neotropical birds that inhabit or stop over in longleaf pine forest, we recommend that consideration be given to modifying and/or increasing the scope and intensity of Dr. Moore's study in the Black Creek Ranger District. Any data gathered on the importance of the proposed maneuver area to neotropical birds will contribute to the development of the least environmentally damaging alternative.

Please let me know what you think about our recommendation.

Sincerely yours,


Allan J. Mueller
Field Supervisor

cc: Forest Supervisor, U.S. Forest Service, Black Creek Ranger Dist.,
P.O. Box 248, Wiggins, MS 39577
Dr. Frank Moore, Dept. of Biological Sciences, Univ. of So. Miss.,
Hattiesburg, MS 39406

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Allan Mueller)

6:1 The study being conducted by Dr. Moore of neo-tropical migrant use of the De Soto National Forest concentrated on the area closer to the coast than the Camp Shelby area. Only one plot fell north of Black Creek. Dr. Moore is currently under contract with the Forest Service investigating neotropical migrants in the De Soto, and his project has been expanded in scope in cooperation with the Mississippi National Guard, adding an extra 10-15 plots in the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area. As of this date his preliminary findings were not available. However, a limited amount of data on neotropical migrants has been collected on Camp Shelby over the past two years on the Army's LCTA plots. Sixty of the approximately 200 permanent plots were each visited twice per nesting season. Songbird data are being collected on an annual basis, initiated in 1990, and has been summarized and included in the FEIS. The Mississippi National Guard has funded a proposal the Spring of 1994 to expand the study farther into the Camp Shelby area.

6:1



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IV

345 COURTLAND STREET, N.E.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30365

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Heinz Mueller)

Responses begin on following page

Mobile District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
CESAM-PD-EI
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628
ATTN: Thomas M. Craven

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for
Military Training within DeSoto National Forest
Camp Shelby, Mississippi

Dear Mr. McClure:

Pursuant to Section 309 of the Clean Air and Section 102 (2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act, EPA, Region IV has reviewed the subject document which describes a number of construction and operational actions which are occurring concurrently at Shelby. Moreover, the present nature and level of military training activities are examined together with the environmental effects of various new facilities necessary to conduct upgraded training. Additionally, an assessment is made regarding the significant changes which will occur in the manner armored and mechanized units conduct their future training at the post.

This type of simultaneous analysis dictated a change in the usual EIS format, i.e., similar subject matter may be covered in different parts of the document to provide continuity and coherence of thought. Procedure and format notwithstanding, the basic thrust of the evaluation deals with the environmental impacts associated with various levels of military training on the national forest lands which comprise a major portion of the post's area of operations.

A Forest Service (FS) special use permit allows military activities on FS lands provided those uses are consistent with FS objectives and are conducted under conditions that protect the public interest. The remaining Camp Shelby lands consist of about 7,200 acres owned by the Army, approximately 1,000 acres of private land leased to the Army, and 7,900 acres which belong to the State of Mississippi.

There are six basic alternatives for the continued, reconfigured military training use of the subject national forest lands. The maneuver area that each will impact varies

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Heinz Mueller)

greatly as a result of the differences in their scope of operation. Regardless, all action alternatives have the very real potential for both short- and long-term adverse environmental impacts to the major components of the national forest, e.g., land cover, wetlands, wildlife, and recreation.

The Army's preferred alternative is to reconfigure the tracked vehicle maneuver areas to allow training which more closely reflects present military doctrine, i.e., Airland Battle. However, these changes would not involve the use of any additional troops or kind/number of vehicles over the status quo. Maneuvers would merely be more complex and would be conducted over an enlarged (different) area. These changes would allow the three armored brigades which use Camp Shelby to train at battalion level on their required tasks. The ultimate goal of these three units is to be able to operate at the brigade level within the confines of the post.

Mitigation, repair, and long-term management are proposed to lessen the effects of the more realistic training. The Army National Guard (NG) has committed to implement these measures through the Integrated Training Area Management Program (ITAMP). This program is anticipated to be capable of lessening all predicted environmental effects to acceptable limits if and when it is fully funded. We have little doubt that this is a genuine commitment, however, whether ITAMP will be capable of creating the desired results, the predictions are valid, and/or full funding will be achieved remain to be determined. Moreover, we understand that certain of the aspects of the program have not been completed. For example, funding for rehabilitation of tracked vehicle maneuver areas needs to be formalized and assigned to a responsible party.

This determination will have to be made even if the area is designated as a Class I site which would make it a priority for action/funding. The operative issue in this regard is how many other areas in the State have been assigned a Class I designation and what will be the funding prioritization among them. The final EIS should detail more precisely how the on-going habitat repair efforts will proceed at Shelby as well as formalize all command and funding relationships for this rehabilitation.

Region IV is aware of how important realistic training has become to the National Guard Bureau. The recent reserve component mobilization demonstrated that the armored training being conducted at Camp Shelby must closely resemble real world demands/conditions; hence, the merits of the proposed battalion maneuvering. Nonetheless, we are on record with the NG as cautioning that any offsite effects be ephemeral and

7:1

7:1 Comment noted. This entire section has undergone major revisions, which reflect many of the concerns raised by the commentator.

7:2

7:2 Comment noted. Clause 43 of the proposed Special Use Permit provides for restricted training should field maneuver uses create an unacceptable level of damage which cannot be repaired. Text of the proposed SUP is in Appendix A.

7:3

7:3 Repair of all regular season training areas was completed to 100% of the programmed need in both 1992 and 1993. Funds have been made available by the Army National Guard Bureau for this purpose, and they have committed to support for this program on an ongoing basis. Regular land maintenance is considered, in this case, a recurring operational cost, and not a part of the 1383 process.

7:4

7:4 The revised text includes a conceptual mitigation plan. The Army National Guard Bureau is committed to providing funding for season to season maintenance and repair of training areas. Clauses 35 and 41 of the proposed SUP provide for timely repair of all maneuver damage. Text of the proposed SUP is in Appendix A.

7:5

7:5 Comment noted.

7:6

7:7

7:8

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Heinz Mueller)

<p>demonstrably insignificant. However, many of the actions which take place within the military reservation are arguably another matter. As the issue now stands, the issue of how much and what specific types of environmental damage are acceptable is evaluated on a case by case basis for areas dedicated to military training.</p> <p>In this regard we have focused our comments on those actions/conditions which we deem to have environmental significance, but do not directly conflict with military training activities and over which the NG can exercise some degree of discretion in carrying out its more immediate mobilization objectives.</p>	<p>7:5</p> <p>7:6 Comment noted. Extensive additional coverage has been added on the history, present use, and potential for effects with respect to the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area.</p>
<p>The Army's preferred alternative (No.1) is to continue training, construct certain new facilities, and expand tank maneuvering to the battalion task force level into 39,772 acres of FS lands. Approximately 20,000 acres of the latter are in the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area (WMA). The WMA is managed under a cooperative agreement between the FS and the Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks. Tank maneuvering expansion for Alternative 1 would require the clearing of 10,229 forested acres in the training areas, 3,876 acres cleared in the corridors that would connect the three training areas, and 7,112 acres thinned in the latter. Thus, if alternative 1 is implemented, 21,217 acres of the proposed 39,772 acre maneuver area would be cleared or thinned. The most significant issue in this regard is the large percentage of 60-year old longleaf pine forest which would be impacted. In Alternative 1 10,809 acres presently used by Camp Shelby would be returned to the FS for management. Finally, the preferred plan would involve leaving islands of thinned forest in the maneuver areas. These would be up to 60 acres in size with some used for concealment and training and some left undisturbed as off limits.</p>	<p>7:6</p> <p>7:7 Comment noted. Please see the response to comment 1:10</p> <p>7:8 Comment noted. Please see the response to comments 1:9 and 1:11. The forested island concept was considered superior to uniform thinning, but is not a part of any current proposal. See Section 1.2.1.3.1 in the Final EIS.</p>
<p>The document attempts to cover a complex, multi-faceted range of military needs and environmental impacts at Camp Shelby, but certain of the discussions need to be clarified in regard to the adverse impacts to forested habitat and wildlife resources. For example, the tree component in those forest islands which will be used for vehicle cover/concealment will be affected by soil compaction and direct root damage. It is conjectural how long these forest dominants will remain alive after recurrent exposure to mechanized vehicles.</p> <p>The document states that the clearing and thinning of thousands of acres of forest for implementation of the preferred plan would actually benefit edge wildlife species. This is not precisely the case, as the intensive tank maneuvering and</p>	<p>7:9</p> <p>7:10 Comment noted. See the discussion on the effects of noise on wildlife (3.1.5.4), the several new sections on biodiversity, and the response to comment 2:371.</p>

7:10	associated activities during the summer would disrupt and negatively impact the activities of all but the most opportunistic wildlife species.	7:11 Preparers agree that the commentor has accurately identified the proposed sequence of planning and decision making.
7:11	While the document contains explicit notations of the areas which would be impacted with each alternative, the precise location of each specific design element has not been delineated. Therefore, when the final option is selected, the record of decision for the project should clearly indicate that extensive field inspection and biological evaluations will be necessary prior to project construction.	7:12 Comment noted. Please see the responses to comments 1:9, 14:7, and 3:18. These responses concern the 50 acre forested island concept (not proposed in the FEIS) and the stress placed on the perimeter trees. In addition, the displacement of wildlife into adjacent areas is discussed in section 3.1.5.4.
7:12	We have reservations about the basis of the observation made in the text that the proposed 50 acre forest islands are desirable to improve wildlife habitat and community structure. Concentrating wildlife into these refugia is much more likely to result in overall adverse consequences. Moreover, altering the microclimate and wind flow into these islands will actually make the forest dominants more susceptible to wind throw and insect/disease predation.	7:13 See new Section 3.3.3 (Quality of Life). Additionally, fugitive dust is addressed in Sections 3.1.3 and 3.2.4, and 3.5.8 of the FEIS. As stated in Section 3.5.8, mitigations beyond roadway dust control are not proposed.
7:13	The additional training capabilities, especially the physical facilities, associated with this proposal have the immediate potential to significantly alter many of the Camp's environmental parameters. Moreover, as the training progresses to its expanded potential, there is the distinct possibility that the adverse impacts which will occur in the maneuvering/range/firing areas will encroach beyond the Camp's boundaries. For example, fugitive dust from upscaled mechanized engagements could become a nuisance off-post. Obscured visibility in the tactical environment simulates actual battle conditions, but this condition will not be appreciated by local civilians who are experiencing it driving to or from work. We suggest additional mitigative measures will need to be installed.	7:14 Comment noted. ITAM has had and will continue to have the full support of the site commander at Camp Shelby and the MSARNG. This commitment is readily evident when viewed from the level of funding to the rapid growth of the environmental awareness program at Camp Shelby over the last two years. See response to comment 7:4.
7:14	The effectiveness of all the mitigative measures mentioned in the document will be in direct relation to how they are applied. It has been our experience that the real mitigation of a problem is a function of command emphasis and sufficient funding to accomplish the job.	7:15 All aspects of the commentors suggestions have already been implemented at Camp Shelby. See also additional coverage of the existing noise complaint program in Section 3.2.4.
7:15	In a related matter the incidence of significant increases in noise beyond the boundaries of the reservation needs to be examined. This study should detail the time and type of exposure together with the classification of receptor site. We suggest that the parameters examined in the Navy's noise evaluation of the operation of the Mid-Atlantic Warfare Range would provide an excellent basis to assess impacts. The use of a work group of local MG personnel and the establishment of a	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Heinz Mueller)

7:15	<p>formalized complaint procedure for noise are steps in the right direction. We suggest that members of the Grandee community be solicited for their thoughts/suggestions.</p> <p>The NG will have to make certain compromises to insure environmental sensitivity which will adversely affect some military training activities. For example, the tank ditches and defilade positions in the engagement areas will either have to be filled in after use or will require expensive engineering solutions (e.g., water diversions, gabriolats, etc.) to address what could become an unacceptable erosion problem. The extended growing season and the relatively mild winters at Shelby should allow fairly rapid reconstitution of the ground cover in the maneuver areas, but the fact remains that this rehabilitation will require time and money which might otherwise be spent in training. We view this as an integral "overhead" cost of this new training, i.e., logistics/administration become more difficult as the scope of an activity expands.</p>
7:16	<p>Presently, the NG is not aware of any off-post perturbations as a result of its present activities. However, this is not necessarily the same as an absence of any problems. We suggest that this statement be substantiated through improved monitoring. From our perspective, any monitoring and other mitigation measures should be made conditions rather than proposals before the implementation of this action. All the measures, plans, research, etc., which have not been completed should be available for review and comment in the Final EIS. Moreover, the ultimately agreed upon conditions should be in place prior to actual construction. This will allow the NG to establish baseline conditions in adjacent streams receiving sediment input from the operational areas, etc., before its activities expand.</p>
7:17	<p>A Section 404 permit will be necessary prior the construction phase of the project, especially for the bridging associated with the extensive upgrades to the road network between the training areas. As you are aware, EPA is currently operating under the policy of "no net functional loss" of wetlands. This does not necessarily mean that certain wetlands can not be filled if there are no practicable alternatives, rather these losses must be compensated in some functional fashion.</p>
7:18	<p>Wetland mitigation was discounted because the projected losses from construction are relatively small, viz., from 4 to 59 acres depending on the alternative. These low values are apparently based on a degree of construction and operational precision that we feel may not be warranted. Additionally, during routine operations it is quite likely that training</p>
7:19	<p>7:16 Current Camp Shelby regulations (Annex G) do require that temporary berms and ditches be filled in, and their restoration inspected by the Environmental Office prior to the return of the unit to their home station. Also, it is recognized in the Final EIS that structural sediment control measures will need to be taken at many locations where revegetation and use of buffer strips may provide inadequate control. See Section 3.4.5 of the Final EIS. We note that Camp Shelby has completed 100% of required maneuver area repair in both 1992 and 1993.</p>
7:20	<p>7:17 Comment noted. The cost of training area rehabilitation is programmed annually, and is recognized as a firm commitment, as stated in Section 1.1, and Clause 43 of the proposed SUP.</p>
7:21	<p>7:18 Comment noted. A revised water quality monitoring plan has been implemented and is discussed in the FEIS. A noise monitoring is scheduled for 1994, which will include off-post communities and recreational areas.</p>
7:22	<p>7:19 Permits will be acquired for those locations where the length of the crossing requires such a permit. Several proposed mitigations are presented in the Final EIS (Section 3.4.5.6).</p>
7:23	<p>7:20 Comment noted. A wide variety of measures are being taken to minimize the accidental effects described here.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Heinz Mueller)

<p>7:20</p>	<p>realism will foster encroachment into buffer zones, water courses, and other biologically sensitive areas. These excursions will result in greater overall adverse impacts to all components of the natural environment than were anticipated in the EIS.</p>	<p>7:21 Comment noted. Wetland buffers have been enlarged as compared to the original proposals, and wetland mitigation alternatives are proposed. See also response to comment 7:19.</p>
<p>7:21</p>	<p>Therefore, when these upgrades become operational we anticipate that direct/indirect wetland losses could be significantly larger than in these preliminary estimates. In keeping with the current policy of "no net functional loss" we recommend that the final EIS include a wetland mitigation plan for all alternatives (design and operation) based on a more realistic scenario. As a start in this regard, the buffer zones should be enlarged to accommodate likely misadventures.</p>	<p>7:22 Comment noted. Actions such as those discussed are anticipated to be a normal part of the site analyses discussed in Section 1.4. See also response to 7:19.</p>
<p>7:22</p>	<p>Since each of these permit actions will have to be handled on a case by case basis. We suggest that technical staff of the involved parties coordinate a site inspection to work out the design/mitigation details. In the past this method has been used effectively to preclude unnecessary delays in a construction schedule. Mr. Mike Wylie (404-347-2126) of the South Wetlands Regulatory Unit should be contacted in this regard.</p>	<p>7:23 Comment noted. Preparers suggest that the more correct interpretation of their presentation is that they believe there are few <i>long term</i> consequences which would remain <i>following appropriate repair and mitigation</i>.</p>
<p>7:23</p>	<p>Currently, the impacts attendant to the proposal are characterized in overview. The list of these impacts and their pervasive nature points to the fact that military training, especially that which involved tracked vehicles, has few peers in terms of its localized adverse environmental impacts. While we have no significant quarrel with these characterizations by kind, we would disagree with the notion prevalent throughout the document that the degree of the effects of these actions are uniformly of nominal environmental consequence. Hence, we suggest that there be some performance deliverables attendant to the inspections carried out by the Forest Service. As it currently stands, it is not sufficiently clear to us how rapidly and to what extent the reconstitution of the vegetative cover/reconstitution of the drainage patterns will proceed.</p>	<p>7:24 A monitoring plan has been proposed as a part of the Final EIS (Section 3.4.6.2), which will provide a form of the performance deliverables proposed by the commentor, and is supported by Clauses 35, 41 and 43 of the proposed SUP (see Appendix A).</p>
<p>7:25</p>	<p>It is important to note that EPA's evaluation rendered no judgement regarding the overall purpose/need of the mechanized training or the priority of training needs cited in the document. Further, because of the scope of the preferred alternative compared to some of the other choices, the former option has the potential for more pronounced adverse impacts to the natural environment which in turn will require greater mitigation.</p>	<p>7:25 Comment noted.</p>
<p>7:26</p>		<p>7:26 Comment noted.</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Heinz Mueller)

On the basis of our review a rating of EC-2 was assigned to the NG's preferred alternative. That is, we have identified a number of environmental concerns attendant to this proposal. However, it appears that the design elements which produced these concerns can be modified to mitigate the adverse consequences to acceptable limits. Our major outstanding reservation deals with those effects/perturbations which are expected to increase beyond the boundaries of the Shelby reservation. The Final EIS should respond to the issues which we raised and/or provide the additional information requested.

7:27


If you wish to discuss any of the above in greater detail, Dr. Gerald Miller (404/347-3776) will serve as initial point of contact.

Sincerely yours,

Heinz Mueller

Heinz J. Mueller, Chief
Environmental Policy Section
Environmental Protection Agency

7:27 Comment noted. The expanded coverage of Quality of Life, including noise management, when combined with the water quality monitoring plan, provide additional material which responds to the commentor's concerns.



Mississippi Department of Archives and History

Historic Preservation Division • Post Office Box 571 • Jackson, Mississippi 39205-0571
Telephone 601-359-6940

November 27, 1991

Mr. Thomas M. Craven
Mobile District, Corps of Engineers
CESAMPDEI
Post Office Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

RE: DEIS for Military Training Use of National
Forest Lands, Camp Shelby, Mississippi (Vols I and II,
November 1991)

We have reviewed the above DEIS which was enclosed with your letter of November 21, 1991. We concur with the assessments concerning cultural resources. In particular, with reference to page 2-47 in Vol. I, this office is of the opinion that no further archaeological survey is necessary and may in fact be an unwise expenditure of public funds.

Thank you for allowing us an opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Elbert R. Hilliard
State Historic Preservation Officer

Roger G. Walker

By: Roger G. Walker
Review and Compliance Officer

RGW/rm

Board of Trustees: William F. Winter, president / Van B. Burnham, Jr. / James P. Coleman / Arch Daley / M. J. Mrs. Stewart Gammill III
Gilbert R. Mason, Sr. / Mrs. Mitchell Robinson / Everette Truly / Sherwood W. Wise / Elbert R. Hilliard, director



MISSISSIPPI CHAPTER, SIERRA CLUB

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mississippi Chapter, Sierra Club (David Lentz)

February 23, 1992

Mobile District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
CESAM-PD-EL, ATTN: Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

Please consider this an official response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued from your office on November 21, 1991 relating to the military training use of DeSoto National Forest by the National Guard units operating out of Camp Shelby, Mississippi. After careful review, I can only conclude that at best the DEIS was inadequately prepared and at worst represents a deliberate attempt to deceive the public and circumvent the laws and regulations pertaining, viz., the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) and U.S. Army Regulation #420-20 on Historic Preservation, effective since 1984. Let me briefly outline why I believe this to be so.

1) All maps in the DEIS, e.g., pp. 1-4 and 2-39, refer to Camp Shelby and the "installation boundary" without giving reference to the boundaries of the DeSoto National Forest. In fact, the actual area of Camp Shelby is limited to only the northwest corner of the land delineated in the maps presented. Most of the land to be impacted, indeed all of the land to be impacted, is currently under the jurisdiction of DeSoto National Forest. Although it is mentioned in the text of the DEIS that Camp Shelby has a special use permit for DeSoto, the true boundary is not illustrated anywhere. This would give the casual observer the impression that Camp Shelby already included DeSoto National Forest and implies that the National Guard is only asking permission to use their own land! This is clearly a deception, since I am sure that the Army knows well enough the borders of their installations. Nor could this be a simple oversight since all maps contain the same misinformation.

2) Another deception in the DEIS concerns the projected effects on the wood products industry and consequently, the regional economy. Alternative #1 will effectively take more than 21,000 acres of prime timber land out of the harvesting cycle. Even though you have addressed the short-term effects, the assessment of "little or no effect" for the long term is patently false.



10:1 Comment noted. Preparers believe the document, especially as expanded in the Final EIS, does conform to the requirements of NEPA and the other regulations cited.

10:2 Comment noted. It is normal for all installations to include all lands used as part of the training facility on their maps. In fact, the Defense Mapping Agency maps in daily use at Camp Shelby and in preparation of the EIS do show the Camp Shelby Training Site boundary as including the entire permit area, and have done so for decades. There has never been any attempt to "deceive" associated with this usage. From the Army point of view, Camp Shelby does include the permitted National Forest lands, and similar situations exist at many installations. A new map, Figure 1-5, has been included to help clarify this question, and the boundary is now labeled "permit boundary" on all figures.

10:3 Comment noted. The effects have been recalculated, are still believed to be negligible over a 40 year period, and are presented in Sections 3.3.2.3.1 and 3.3.4.3.

10:1

10:2

10:3

3) On page 4-9 of the DEIS it is stated that the clear-cutting of land in the Leaf River Wildlife Refuge may "...have a positive effect on recreation." This is an absurd assertion. I have seen what the National Guard has done in the portions of DeSoto that it is currently using, and no one I know would pursue recreational activities there.

4) On page 4-4 it is stated that none of the proposed alternatives will effect wilderness and scenic areas, however alternatives #1 and 2 propose clear-cutting in the watershed of the Black Creek Wild and Scenic Stream. This plus training activities will surely lead to erosion and sedimentation flowing into Black Creek. The DEIS clearly indicates problems of this nature in presently utilized areas of Camp Shelby and states, "Current training activities have resulted in erosion processes that have caused excess sedimentation in some riverine wetlands of Camp Shelby (p.3-12)." NEPA emphatically requires a "...detailed statement by the responsible official on any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented (Sec. 102c)." The DEIS has not done this in regard to Black Creek and therefore is not in compliance with the law.

5) The outlined plans for managing the biodiversity of DeSoto seem equally flawed. As a biologist I can tell you that species do not exist as individuals, but as populations. Accordingly, the "micro refuges" concept is doomed to failure since natural populations are not fixed entities and even the slow-moving gopher tortoise occasionally will migrate into new areas. The best management plan for the gopher tortoise and the commensal eastern indigo snake would be to maintain a fire-climax longleaf pine forest in a protected area such as the Leaf River Wildlife Refuge. Alternative 3b should definitely be the preferred plan if the military is interested in halting the decline of these unique animals and complying with the Endangered Species Act.

6) The red-cockaded woodpecker, another endangered species, was once a common bird in the area to be impacted. Since they need trees that are 60 years or older for nesting sites and the average age of the stand in the Leaf River Wildlife Refuge is about 55 years, we are on the verge of having a large area of suitable habitat for these rare birds. To clear-cut in the refuge will eliminate this possibility and will contribute to the extinction of the woodpecker. No adequate discussion of this option is presented in the DEIS.

7) Archaeological/historical resources are inadequately assessed. Less than 3% of the land under consideration has been surveyed so it cannot be reasonably asserted that no National Register sites can be found in the areas of impact. To merely presume that no archaeological sites of importance will be found in an area to be modified using government funds certainly violates the spirit of the NHPA, even if the SHPO has agreed. If every project made this assumption, then no one would have to conduct surveys, countless sites would be destroyed and the law would soon become meaningless.

10:4 Comment noted. This statement in the Draft EIS did not intend to imply that all types of recreational activities would be enhanced or unaffected, but that many types, especially fall and winter hunting opportunity, might be somewhat improved. Considerable coverage has been added which focuses on the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area.

10:5 It is acknowledged in the EIS that there is, and has been, some sediment contribution to surface water systems from exposed soil in training areas. The sections on soils, wetlands, and surface water have been extensively revised, and should answer your concerns. There is no intention to allow uncontrolled movement of sediment into any surface waters. Following implementation of the mitigation procedures described in sections 3.4.2 through 3.4.6, there should be no decrease in the water quality of Black Creek or the other major streams in the watershed.

10:6 See the new coverage on biodiversity in Sections 2.4.7, 3.1.2.6, 3.3.2.6, 3.4.10, and 3.5.7. Please also see general misconception statement numbers 6 and 7.

10:7 Please see the response to comments 1:2, 1:3 and 1:10.

10:8 Out of a total of 105,203 acres addressed in the DEIS, 10,915 acres fell within High Potential Areas. Of these 10,915 acres, 4,356 acres were archeologically surveyed. 4.1% of the total acres (105,203) have been surveyed. A total of 39% of all High Potential areas have been surveyed. All historic preservation work was conducted in accordance with the Historic Preservation Plan agreed to by the Forest Service and the Mississippi SHPO. A survey meeting the requirements of Section 106 will precede any construction activities outside the dedicated artillery impact area.

All historic preservation work conducted at Camp Shelby has been performed in compliance with the National Historic Preservation of 1966 as amended in 1980 and Army Regulation 420-40. In addition, close coordination has been maintained between the staff of the Mississippi State Historic Preservation Officer, the Mississippi National Guard, the U.S. Forest Service and the Mobile District Corps of Engineers Historic Preservation staff.

The first cultural resources work at Camp Shelby consisted of a cultural resources assessment. This work consisted of extensive drive throughs of the Camp to determine land forms and their use by the military and forest service. In January 1986, representatives from the Mobile District, the Mississippi SHPOs office, and the Forest Service met at Camp Shelby to visit previously located sites and to discuss future survey needs and strategies. Needs and strategies were largely founded on existing land forms, past archeological work, and past land use patterns within the boundaries of Camp Shelby.

Response to Comment 10:8 continued on next page

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mississippi Chapter, Sierra Club (David Lentz)

Response to Comment 10:8 continued from previous page

In compliance with Army Regulation 420-40, a Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) was developed to address management of historic resources located at Camp Shelby. In May 1986, a draft of the HPP and a Memorandum of Agreement was submitted to the Mississippi National Guard and the National Guard Bureau for review. In November 1986, the HPP and MOA were submitted to the Mississippi SHPO, the Forest Service, and the Advisory Council for review and comment. The Forest Service and Mississippi SHPO accepted the HPP once their comments were incorporated into the document. The Advisory Council has never responded even after repeated request to do so. The National Guard Bureau, by letter dated March 25, 1988, informed the Advisory Council that the historic preservation recommendation contained within the HPP were being implemented.


The HPP divided Camp Shelby into three different categories based upon their likelihood to possess intact and potentially significant cultural resources. The three categories are: 1) high disturbed areas, 2) moderate disturbed areas, and 3) low disturbed areas. High disturbance areas were considered to be those lands which have undergone extensive and massive alterations as to have no potential for possessing significant archeological remains. Moderate disturbance areas include those lands which have been heavily impacted by track vehicle maneuvers and other motorized traffic. Low disturbance areas are those lands that have been less severely impacted from military impact.

No survey was recommended for high disturbance areas. Low and moderate disturbance areas were selected for survey in tandem with the U.S. Forest Service, the Mississippi SHPO and the Mobile District. Areas identified for survey were called High Potential Areas. The HPP recommended that a 10% sample of HPs be selected from the Moderately Disturbance land areas. A 20% sample of HPs with the Low Disturbance land areas was recommended. Once survey of these areas was accomplished further consultation with the Mississippi SHPO was held for the need to conduct additional surveys. The 10% and 20% levels for each category were exceeded. A 40% sample of the moderate disturbed HPs were surveyed and a 34% sample of low disturbed HPs were surveyed. No intact and significant historic resources were discovered during these surveys. Based on this information and discussions with representatives with the U.S. Forest Service, the Mississippi SHPOs office and Mobile District no further archeological survey was recommended for Camp Shelby. By letter dated December 2, 1988, the Mississippi SHPO agreed with this finding.

The above described actions placed the Mississippi National Guard in full compliance with the appropriate provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended in 1980 and Army Regulation 420-40.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mississippi Chapter, Sierra Club (David Lentz)

10:9 In short, the DEIS has failed to justify its claim of no significant impact on the proposed areas of use. Furthermore, it is woefully short of the mandate set forth in NEPA which requires all Federal Government agencies to "...fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations (Sec. 101b1)." The Guard will be violating this mandate if they proceed to destroy the Leaf River Wildlife Refuge as they have proposed in Alternatives 1 and 2. While I personally prefer that the Guard does not expand their activities in DeSoto, Alternative 3b represents a compromise plan that would give the military the land they need, yet keep the Refuge intact. It seems that 3b represents something that all of us could live with without further recriminations and dissention.

10:10 Thank you for your careful consideration of these comments. Sincerely,

David L. Lentz, PhD.,
Chair, Central Mississippi Group
P.O. Box 4335
Jackson, MS 39296-4335

cc: Mr. Ken Johnson

10:9 All historic preservation work at Camp Shelby was conducted in strict accordance with Army Regulation 420-40. Special attention was given to Chapter 2, Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) Paragraphs 2-10 (Overview Standards) and 2-11 (Inventory Standards).

10:10 Comment noted. The proposed uses of National Forest lands have been fully authorized by appropriate legislation and rulemaking, and the procedures set forth have been followed. The proponent believes that there are no irrevocable, adverse environmental consequences associated with any alternative. As stated in Section 2.3.1, the return of lands to forest management, or any other use, could take place at any future time, and visible evidence of the military use obliterated within 20 to 40 years. The trusteeship responsibilities referred to thus appear to have been met.

10:11 Comment noted. Alternative 3B was proposed during the scoping process, and has never been believed to meet full operations needs OR to protect the gopher tortoise, as required by the Endangered Species Act. Please also see discussions of misconceptions 7 and 9 in Section 1, Volume III, of this FEIS.

State of Louisiana



Department of Wildlife and Fisheries
Post Office Box 98000
Baton Rouge, LA 70898-9000
(504) 765-2800

Joe L. Herring
Secretary

Edwin W. Edwards
Governor

14 February 1992

Thomas M. Craven, Ecologist
Inland Environment Section
Mobile District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

I would like to take this opportunity to offer some comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement: Military Training Use of National Forest Lands Camp Shelby, Mississippi (DEIS). I reviewed the DEIS at the request of Dr. Cheri Jones, Co-chair of the Gopher Tortoise Council. Although I read the documents with the tortoise in mind, I have also taken the liberty of commenting on other issues.

Because all actions will be governed by the Biological Opinions rendered by the Fish and Wildlife Service to the National Guard Bureau (26 January 1989) and U.S. Forest Service (26 July 1990), I feel confident that the actions proposed under the preferred alternative will not jeopardize the continued existence of gopher tortoises within the proposed use areas. However, my confidence did not result from a reading of the DEIS, which gave only cursory attention to actions needed to minimize disturbance to tortoises existing within the Proposed Training Areas (PTAs). The DEIS does not provide enough data to determine how the PTA's relate to existing gopher tortoise colonies and isolated burrows. Without that information, I cannot fully assess the potential conflicts.

The maps provided with the DEIS note the locations of "Threatened Species", which I presume refer to gopher tortoise colonies and/or burrows (active?). An examination of the maps for the six PTA's reveals the occurrence of 146 gopher tortoise colonies/burrows, with 39 (27%) potentially affected by thinning or clearcutting of adjacent timber. Will active colonies/burrows within areas slated for clearing be contained within "forest islands" or will they be left in open areas? If it is the latter, I have little faith that simply marking the burrows will ensure long-term protection from accidental encounters with heavy equipment.

I am also concerned about the relatively large amount of longleaf forest that will be withdrawn from FS management under Alternatives 1 and 2. As you know, that timber type typically provides high-quality tortoise habitat and the loss of 5,000-10,000 acres is significant. If you have not done so already, consider modifying the PTA's so that a minimum of longleaf forest is included in the sites proposed for clearing. The loss of longleaf pine forest is of concern to numerous professionals throughout the southeast, and should not be taken lightly. The loss can be partially mitigated if Desoto National Forest converts the cleared "turnback areas" to longleaf on longleaf sites, as is their current policy.

An Equal Opportunity Employer

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (Richard Martin)

11:1 Your concern is noted. As described in Section 1.2.1 of the Final EIS (Section 1.2.0 of the DEIS), the boundaries of the Proposed Training Areas (PTAs) were designed to exclude gopher tortoise colonies and priority soils (whether occupied or not). The subsequent Biological Opinions (1992 and 1993) specifically note this design of proposed tracked vehicle maneuver areas, and also note a small number of isolated individuals for which relocation is considered acceptable. The full text of the Biological Opinions is reproduced at Appendix L. Please also see the responses to comments 1:2, 1:4, 1:12, and 1:33.

11:2 Please see the response to comment 11:1.

11:3 Comment noted. The PTAs have been modified to accommodate the federally threatened gopher tortoise. The longleaf pine acreage to be cleared or thinned in Alternative 1 has essentially remained the same. See figures added to Section 3.3.2.1.1 for a breakdown of the longleaf pine acreage affected by alternative. Please also see the response to comment 1:10.

11:1

11:2

11:3

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (Richard Martin)

Writing as someone who considers himself a "conservation biologist", I am keenly aware of the trendy nature of this field and how many principles of conservation biology are often misapplied or misused. I would like to point out two such examples from the DEIS. The term "biodiversity" is not simply a synonym for local species richness, as the DEIS occasionally implies, but rather refers to the full complement of species at a regional, national, or global level in the proportion expected under natural conditions. Encouraging edge and early-successional species does nothing to preserve biological diversity *in toto*. Few people would ever state that clearing large tracts of land and creating permanent openings benefits biological diversity as stated in Chapter 4 of the DEIS.

11:4

11:4 Comment noted. It has been agreed to use a new definition of biodiversity throughout the document, and it is presented in Section 1.2.1.4.3 of the Final EIS. Please also see the response to comment 2:371.

The DEIS also contains several comments on habitat fragmentation. The comments that leaving islands of forest within cleared PTA's would reduce fragmentation is not correct; in fact, fragmentation would be maximized. In contrast, the proposal to connect "passive cover" areas to wetland buffer strips and 1/4 habitat is encouraged as it would effectively increase block size and reduce fragmentation.

11:5

11:5 Comment noted. Islands were stated as being preferable to, and resulting in less fragmentation than, uniform severe thinning to about 90% removal, as had previously been proposed. The suggestion made here is, in fact, very similar to the habitat corridor approach used in the revised proposals. See also the responses to comments 1:9 and 1:12.

I would like to end my comments on a positive note and commend the National Guard Bureau for their obvious attention to the importance of environmental education and the efforts expended on erosion remediation and prevention; two very important concerns on military reservations.

11:6

11:6 Your comment is noted.

In summary, although the preferred alternative will undoubtedly have some negative effects on the Camp Shelby tortoise population, the guidelines proposed in the Biological Opinions and the designation of the tortoise preserve provide a model framework for tortoise management and should ensure the long-term survival of tortoises on the reservation.

11:7

11:7 Comment noted.

Sincerely,



Richard Martin
Zoologist, Louisiana Natural Heritage Program
State Representative, Gopher Tortoise Council

CC: Dr. Cheri Jones
Mississippi Museum of Natural Science
111 North Jefferson St.
Jackson, MS 39201-2897

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Citizens for Camp Shelby (Johnny McArthur)

February 27, 1992

Department of Army
Mobile District Corps of Engineers
Inland Environment Section
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Attention: Mr. Craven

As the chairman of the Citizens for Camp Shelby Committee, I would like to submit the following information into the record as comment to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Military training use of National Forest Lands at Camp Shelby, Mississippi.

First, it is important for you to understand our group. We are concerned citizens of the region who realized the economic impact over the years of Camp Shelby and wanted to promote the camps well being and development. Our group started early in 1990 to have input into the decision making process of the camps growth. The committee is composed of 44 members representing the retail, commercial, and industrial community of the area surrounding Camp Shelby, Mississippi. We serve without compensation as a volunteer group to advocate the military in our community.

As we began to read the DEIS study and attended the public forums, we broke our committee into three groups: Economic Impact, Recreational Impact, and Environmental Impact. I personally was in charge of the Economic Impact assessment and my comments are as follows:

With regard to Economic Impact to Camp Shelby the evaluation appears in chapter 3 p.p. 22-23, 91-93, 133-134. We agree with the five county region (Lamar Co., Forrest Co., Perry Co., Stone Co., and Green Co.) that was used to measure the effect of Economic Impact on the community. Our feelings are that their is additional substantial economic impact that was not fully considered.

Our investigations have resulted in over 137 million dollar impact to the region. This was compiled by reviewing the following figures:

PERSONAL PAYROLL ACTIVITY	AMOUNT	
* Federal Employees Pay (570 people x 25,000)	\$ 14,250,000.00	
* Regional Guardsman Payroll Annual (Part Time)	7,000,000.00	
* Full Time Payroll of the Regional Units	9,000,000.00	
* Part time seasonal employees (250 X 4000)	1,000,000.00	
* Weekend Payroll of Units Who Train at Shelby	9,000,000.00	
Total Payroll Impact	\$ 30,000,000.00	
# If a conservative multiplier were applied	X 3	
* Total payroll impact after multiplier applied	\$ 90,000,000.00	
* Figures provided by Camp Shelby, by Louis F. Pace, CW4, MSARNG, Director Resource Management.		
# (Sum of 3.1.41.1 EIFS model 3.679 + 2.454 + 1.716/3 = 2.62)		

12:1 Comment noted.

12:2 Comment noted. The assumptions in your independent estimate are somewhat more optimistic than those used in the Economic Impact Forecast System model, and the total effect is therefore greater, but we agree that the contribution of Camp Shelby training activities to the regional economy is substantial.

12:1

12:2

12:3 Comment noted. The proposals are to enhance the training capability of present units, rather than to add more units and personnel. Please see Section 1.2.8 of the Final EIS and general misconception statements 3 and 25.

12:4 Your comment is noted. As of October 1, 1991, there were 1,149,892 acres under the administration of the National Forests in Mississippi.

12:5 Your comment and the information provided are noted. Please refer to misconception 25.

Other Expenditures at Camp Shelby		12:2
* 5 year construction average = \$ 10,000,000.00 per year		
* Base operations our last 2 year average \$ 10,000,000.00 per year.		
During troop training (3 weeks) the average spent by a trooper is calculated by Attachment A as \$ 150.00. If multiplied by the number of troops in training 60,000, the economic impact for the region would be in excess of \$ 9,000,000 per training period. Which turns over in our local economy at least three times for a \$ 27,000,000 impact.		
The total impact to the local economy is summarized as:		
Payroll Impact With Multiplier	\$ 90,000,000.00	
Construction (Annual)	10,000,000.00	
Operations (Annual)	10,000,000.00	
Troop Expenditures (per training)	27,000,000.00	
Total Impact Annually	\$ 137,000,000.00	

The expansion of tank training at Camp Shelby is a must if the Camp is to survive military consolidation and training downsizing. Battalion level training is requested and required to maintain a viable facility.

The U.S. Forest Service has under its watch care in Mississippi some 23,000,000 acres of Forest lands and can capably manage 1% or the affected 23,000 at Camp Shelby.

The comment was made during the public forums that sales taxes were not increased during the period of May through July, during the training period for the Camp. An evaluation done by the city of Hattiesburg in comparison with college communities, Starkville, MS, and Oxford, MS shows that Hattiesburg makes up its student population loss with the Military training component and infact increases its sales tax. In attachment B you can see that 1% is gained in Hattiesburg which translates into 6.1 million dollars for each month (June, July).

The city of Hattiesburg's Controller says, "It is apparently a valid observation that Hattiesburg's summer sales tax checks consistently account for a larger portion of Hattiesburg's total yearly sales taxes than do Starkville and Oxford's." This has significant positive impact on area merchants who strive to please their customers whether it be the college student or the military.

* Figures provided by Camp Shelby, by Louis F. Pace, CW4, MSARNG, Director Resource Management.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Citizens for Camp Shelby (Johnny McArthur)

One of our other subcommittees was chaired by Mr. Leighton Lewis and his committee's conclusion are in attachment C. There the committee found that the DEIS evaluation went well beyond the reconfigured training areas and exhaustively evaluated the environmental impact. As a result the subcommittee recommends proceeding with alternative one as its choice for expanded training.

The Recreation subcommittee was given the task to review and evaluate items concerning public recreational access to the camp, Mr. Freeman Parker was given the task of reviewing with the group the DEIS information and there report is submitted as attachment D.

All in all the committee found the DEIS to be complete, accurate, insightful, responsible and equitable and we commend the selection of alternative 1 as our primary choice for reconfiguration of Camp Shelby, MS.

In conclusion, the economic benefits to our communities area is so great when having a violate battalion level training facility ready to train the next generation of troops that prepare to defend our way of life. The minor environmental impact is only a reasonable trade off but a mighty small price to pay for the economic good of the region and the State of Mississippi. We commend the preparers of this Draft EIS and look forward to the positive response of the community as we continue to build on 75 years of military training and partnership with the Camp Shelby of the next century.

Sincerely,

Johnny McArthur

Johnny McArthur
Chairman, Citizens for Camp Shelby

CITIZENS FOR CAMP SHELBY COMMITTEE

Allen, John	Forrest County Board of Supervisors
Barefield, Stone	Trustmark National Bank
Barr, Dexter	City of Hattiesburg
Biggerstaff, Ben	Forrest County Board of Supervisors
Borsig, Jim	Chain Electric Company
Cartledge, Lynn	
Chain, Bobby L.	
Dambrino, Rob	
Daniels, Bob	
Daniels, Hobert	
Dyess, Dwight	Bank of Mississippi
Garvey, Mike	J. Ed Turner Company
Gay, Jack	City of Petal
Genin, Ron	
Griffing, John A.	Office Supply Company
Herrington, Terry	

12:6 Comment noted.

12:7 Comment noted.

12:8 Comment noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Citizens for Camp Shelby (Johnny McArthur)

ATTACHMENT D

Please Print Clearly		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings
Name: Freeman Parker		Jackson, MS
Address: Citizens for Camp Shelby 106 Wildwood Trace		January 7, 1992
City: Hattiesburg	State: MS Zip: 39402	
COMMENT NO: 1 RESOURCE AREA: RECREATION ACTIVITY		
Subsection 2.5.4, page 2, Chapter 2. It should be noted that there is a high usage of trail bikers, saddle horses, and all-terrain vehicles in the proposed training area. They are used by hunters as well as for trail riding.		
COMMENT NO: 2 RESOURCE AREA: RECREATION ACTIVITY		
Subsection 3.2.3.4, page 3-92, Chapter 2. It should mention the following: Emergency Medical Airships will have greater access to individuals who may be injured during the enjoyment of recreation activities in the new maneuver area.		
COMMENT NO: 3 RESOURCE AREA: RECREATION ACTIVITY		
Subsection 2.2.3.4, page 3-92, Chapter 3. It should include that the additional trail will enhance the use of trailbikers, saddle horses, and all-terrain vehicles.		
COMMENT NO: 4 RESOURCE AREA: RECREATION ACTIVITY		
Subsection 3.2.3.4, page 3-92, Chapter 3. Additions to the open space created for the maneuver area will provide greater opportunity for non-hunters to view the grazing wildlife.		
COMMENT NO: 5 RESOURCE AREA: RECREATION ACTIVITY		
Subsection 3.2.3.4, page 3-92, Chapter 3. The use of maneuver area by handicapped hunters, that is, those unable to walk, will be enhanced by the use of the corridors and open spaces since these individuals must ride ATV's.		

- 12:15 Comment noted. Listing of additional types of recreational usage has been added to Section 2.5.4.
- 12:16 The concept you suggest has been added to the presentation at Section 3.3.3.4 in the Final EIS.
- 12:17 Discussion of the potential for effects on the use of the area by horseback riders, trailbikers, and ATV's has been added in Section 3.3.3.4.
- 12:18 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 12:17
- 12:19 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 12:17

ATTACHMENT C

ENVIRONMENTAL SUBCOMMITTEE
CHAIRMAN, LEIGHTON LEWIS

This letter is offered in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement prepared to evaluate reconfiguration of Camp Shelby training areas on U.S. Forestry Service lands to accommodate brigade sized maneuvers for armored vehicles.

First it should be noted that the EIS went well beyond evaluation of the reconfigured training areas. It studied and evaluated "the cumulative effects of all Army activities past, present and proposed...in the context of...new land management capabilities and programs." Therefore, a key element of the study is evaluation of land management capabilities and programs at Camp Shelby. 12:9

We find the EIS to be thoroughly researched and documented. It's independence and impartiality should not be questioned. It was under the management of the USA Corps of Engineers, Mobile District using the resources of the Construction Engineering Research Laboratory, the Waterways Experiment Station and an extensive bibliography of research documents and writings. Some 50 individuals representing various disciplines and fields of expertise contributed to the document. 12:10

The EIS complied with the procedures of the National Environmental Policy Act and addressed environmental issues arising from public comment at scoping meetings such as identification and protection of threatened and endangered species, soil erosion, protection of wetlands, noise levels, effects of land clearing on wildlife, monitoring procedures and compliance with existing environmental laws. 12:11

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Citizens for Camp Shelby (Johnny McArthur)

12:9 Comment noted.

12:10 Comment noted.

12:11 Comment noted.

12:12 Comment noted.

12:13 Comment noted.

12:14 Comment noted.

After review of the statement and several independent meetings with Camp Shelby officials, we concur with the findings of the EIS that military training at Camp Shelby can be carried out with minimal effect on the environment. An aggressive avoidance program coupled with the Integrated Training Area Management program already underway are proving to be effective.	12:12
New technology such as a Geographic Information System called Geographic Resources Analysis Support System is greatly enhancing the existing programs to effectively rehabilitate land and forest and avoid, protect and buffer wetlands and habitat of threatened and endangered species.	12:13
We therefore urge preparation of the final EIS as written, and encourage the U.S. Forestry Service to proceed with amendment of the Use Permit to allow requested reconfiguration of training areas at Camp Shelby as provided under alternative one.	12:14

Herrington, Terry	Office Supply Company
Hughes, Jess	City of Hattiesburg
Jefcoat, Patricia	
Johnson, Don	
Johnston, Ernestine	
Lee, James L.	Lamar County Board of Supervisors
Lewis, G. Leighton	Bank of Mississippi
McArthur, J.W.	McArthur Company
McCaffrey, Charlie	Blendco, Inc.
McIlwain, Ben	Richton Bank & Trust
Mixon, Bob	Courtesy Ford, Inc.
Montague, Brian	Montague, Pittman, Rogers & Schwartz
Morgan, Ed	City of Hattiesburg
Parker, Freeman	Forrest General Hospital
Perkins, Jerry	
Phalen, Tim	
Phillips, Carolyn	Methodist Hospital
Ray, William K.	
Reynolds, C.L.	Cabot Lodge
Riddle, Barbara	Honda Sports Center
Risk, Nick	Days Inn
Simmons, Frances	Simmons Consulting Engineers
Simmons, Richard G.	Catholic Engineering Equipment
Tatum, Joseph	Mississippi Power Company
Walley, Tommy	Mississippi Power Company
Williams, David	
Williamson, G.D.	
Wolford, Bobby	

Page Intentionally Left Blank

Attachments A and B (7 pages)
Included with this Letter Have Not
Been Reproduced in this FEIS.



SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS

Representing the Forestry Profession in Mississippi and the Nation

February 28, 1992


Mr. Thomas M. Craven
Ecologist, Inland Environment Section
Department of the Army
Mobile District, Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

Please find enclosed the comments submitted by the Mississippi Society of American Foresters regarding the Draft EIS on Military Training Use of National Forest Lands, Camp Shelby, MS.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,


Jerry Pelly
Chairman

CHAPTERS
Broadleaf
Capitol
Four Lakes
Homochitto
Loblolly
Longleaf
Magnolia
Northeast
STUDENT
CHAPTER
Mississippi State
University

M I S S I S S I P P I S O C I E T Y

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mississippi Society of American Foresters (Jerry Pelly)

Responses Begin on Following Page

*Professionals advancing the science, technology, practice and
teaching of forestry to benefit society.*



SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS

Representing the Forestry Profession in Mississippi and the Nation

MISSISSIPPI SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS POSITION STATEMENT

DRAFT EIS MILITARY TRAINING USE OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS FOR CAMP SHELBY, MS.

The Mississippi Society of American Foresters take the following position on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on Military Training Use of National Forest Lands, Camp Shelby, Mississippi.

The Mississippi Society of American Foresters supports the U.S. Forest Service in Mississippi in its administration of the special use permit. The Society expects the Forest Service to provide funding and authority to on-the-ground personnel to assure compliance with all conditions of the special use permit and environmental assessments for construction of any facilities.

The Mississippi Society of American Foresters does not take a position on any particular alternative. We feel the U.S. Forest Service in Mississippi has ample resources to evaluate the forestry, prescribed fire, fire prevention, fire control, timber, fish & wildlife, recreation, wetlands, soils, water and threatened and endangered species. We go on record as supporting their review and input on these topics.

The Mississippi Society of American Foresters opposes the acquisition of any private property for mitigation. The Mississippi Society of American Foresters also opposes any condemnation of private lands resulting from the extension of tank maneuvering areas as this measure violates individual property rights.

The Mississippi Society of American Foresters opposes increases of any harvest volume over the current allowable timber cut on the Black Creek Ranger District because of the potential negative impacts to the local economy and to the Forest Service budget and personnel.

Thomas L. Price, Chair
MS SAF Review Team
DEIS Camp Shelby

*Professionals advancing the science, technology, practice and
teaching of forestry to benefit society.*

M I S S I S S I P P I S O C I E T Y

CHAPTERS
Broadleaf
Capitol
Four Lakes
Homochitto
Loblolly
Longleaf
Magnolia
Northeast
STUDENT
CHAPTER
Mississippi State
University

13:1 Comment noted. The Mississippi Military Department currently reimburses, under clause 35 of the Special Use permit, the Forest Service for costs associated with administering the provisions of the permit. A Forest Service employee is assigned full time to permit administration throughout the AT period and as needed during the remainder of the year. This practice will continue under the proposed permit.

13:2 Comment noted.

13:3 Comment noted. Major land acquisition for compensation purposes is not proposed in this document. While the exact number of acres of wetlands which would be lost, and for which offset lands might be required to be purchased, will not be known until the final site engineering studies are prepared, it is not expected to exceed 100 acres. These lands would probably be required to be designated wetlands, which are not likely to be highly productive forest lands at this time, and almost certainly not actively producing pine timber.

13:4 The concerns voiced in this comment are addressed in Section 3.3.2.3 and their mitigation examined in Section 3.4.9 of the Final EIS.

13:1

13:2

13:3

13:4

PINE WOODS CHAPTER NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY

10 December 1991

James F. Puckett, M.D.
President, Pine Woods Chapter
of the National Audubon Soc.
P.O. Box 16863
Hattiesburg, MS 39404-6863

Mr. Tom Craven
Department of the Army
Mobile District Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven,

I've written to you as an individual, concerning the period for public comment and the scheduling of the public meetings on the DRAFT EIS for the "Military Training Use of National Forest Lands, Camp Shelby, Mississippi", and now I'm writing you on behalf of Pine Woods Chapter of the National Audubon Society to request that the period for public comment be extended and that the public meetings be delayed until late January or early February.

14:1

Again, I justify this request on the basis of the documents release during the very busy holiday seasons of Thanksgiving and Christmas/New Year's making difficult any responsible evaluation of the results of your two years labor. Pine Woods Audubon submitted a position statement (copy enclosed) during the scoping process and the chapter would like to do so again after a thorough evaluation of the Draft EIS' address of the questions raised in that position statement. The chapter's monthly meeting was on 5 December 1991, too soon after the release of the Draft EIS for such an evaluation. We will not meet again until 9 January 1992, a date that falls after the public meeting scheduled for Hattiesburg, thus making it very difficult for those of us involved in the evaluation to inform the general membership about the issue, and for the general membership to consider and vote on a follow-up position proposal.

As I stated in my personal letter to you, my feeling, from the Agency Briefing in Jackson, 22 November, and from a cursory examination of the Draft EIS, is that your office has made an attempt to prepare a document that valued the public input received during the scoping process. I hope that is the case and that you will continue to do so by permitting more time for a thoughtful evaluation.

14:2

Sincerely,

James F. Puckett, M.D.
James F. Puckett, M.D.

14:1 Comment noted. As noted in Section 1.1.7.2 of the Final EIS, while the public meetings were held as proposed, in early January, the comment period was extended to March 1, 1992. In practice, all comments received were considered, no matter when received.

14:2 Comment noted.

Exhibit # 6

POSITION STATEMENT
of
PINE WOODS CHAPTER, NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY
on
CAMP SHELBY LAND EXCHANGE between the DESOTO NATIONAL
FOREST and MISSISSIPPI NATIONAL GUARD (adopted 7 December,
1989)

The Pine Woods Chapter of the National Audubon Society is opposed to any exchange of land title between the Department of Defense (Mississippi National Guard-Camp Shelby) and the Department of Agriculture (U.S. Forest Service-DeSoto National Forest).

The Pine Woods Chapter supports the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and urges the Forest Service and the military to follow the full spirit of the NEPA process.

We ask for analysis and evaluation of the following points in the assessment of the environmental, cultural and economic impact of the proposed Federal action.

1. Conduct an intense survey to permit adequate evaluation of the impact to all threatened, endangered and/or sensitive, individual plant and animal species and their communities. Special attention should be accorded the Red Cockaded Woodpecker (Picoides borealis), with attention given to active sites, currently inactive sites, the number and location of candidate cavity trees and their preservation for potential future expansion of present populations of RCW's. Special attention should also be accorded Bewick's Wren (Thryomanes bewickii); Bachmann's Sparrow (Alimophila gestivalis); the Gopher Tortoise (Gopherus polyphemus); Pitcher Plant (Sarracenia sp.); Bogs; Indigo Snake (Drymarchon corais couperi), and its inter-relationship with the Gopher Tortoise; and Pine Barren Prairie Clover (Petalostemon gracilis).

2. Evaluate the potential loss of an additional 32,000 acres of Red Cockaded Woodpecker habitat in relationship to the 70,000-100,000 acres destroyed by Hurricane Hugo in the Francis Marion National Forest, South Carolina.

3. Display on a map (scale: at least 2" = 1 mile) the streams and wetlands on the 32,000 acres. Describe the best management practices to be applied as required by the appropriate Federal regulations and Presidential Executive Order (no net loss of wetlands) for any and all proposed uses involving streams and wetlands.

4. Display on a map (scale: at least 2" = 1 mile) the locations and harvest specifications for the proposed timber cutting on the 32,000 acres. Evaluate the cumulative effects of any tree removal without regeneration planting, on the timber industry in the local area, with attention to loss of jobs, retail sales and road and school revenues to the counties affected.

14:3 No transfer of the title of any National Forest lands is sought under any alternative. Please also see misconception 12.

14:4 Comment noted.

14:5 Section 2.4 in the Final EIS presents the occurrence and status of each of these species, among many others. Potential impacts to them are examined in Sections 3.1.2.5 and 3.3.2.5. Please also see the responses to comments 1:2 and 1:4.

14:6 Comment noted. While the Marion National Forest population does not interact directly with any Mississippi populations, the following information is provided to bring you up to date on the effects of Hurricane Hugo on the RCW. The hurricane severely damaged and degraded the habitat, but the habitat was not destroyed. This is based on the tremendous response the RCW has shown since the hurricane. Most RCW cavities were destroyed during the hurricane. An intensive artificial cavity program was initiated. In 1990, the first breeding season after Hugo, there were 579 adult RCW's in 369 active colonies. These birds fledged 285 young, an average of 1.2 birds/clan fledged. In 1992, there were 775 adult RCW's in 376 colonies that fledged 473 young (1.47 birds fledged/clan). If the habitat was destroyed, these responses should not have occurred.

With respect to the status of the bird on the De Soto National Forest, the current Forest Service Wildlife Management Handbook, on which a US Fish & Wildlife Biological Opinion was issued, defines a recovery population goal of 250 clans for the De Soto National Forest. It has since been agreed that in the absence of specific nesting or clan data, that 500 active colonies are needed to ensure 250 clans. This is due to the number of pairs that do not reproduce regularly and single bird colonies. It is estimated that approximately 200 acres of Lower Coastal Plain suitable habitat is needed to sustain a clan/colony. Therefore 100,000 acres of pine or pine-hardwood forest type is necessary to ensure the presence of habitat to support recovery of the De Soto RCW population.

The National Forests in Mississippi Land and Resource Management Plan estimates there were over 272,000 acres of suitable foraging habitat in 1982. There are no known existing active colonies (Appendix N) in the Camp Shelby permit area. Therefore the potential loss of approximately 20,000 acres of RCW habitat containing no active colonies will have no effect on obtaining a recovery population on the De Soto National Forest. The most biologically sound place to establish a recovery population is where there is an existing population, which would be outside the Camp Shelby permit area.

There is no comparison between this action and its effect on RCW populations and that of Hurricane Hugo in South Carolina. The habitat lost in South Carolina was fully occupied by RCW colonies. The potential habitat loss envisioned in this action occurs where no active colonies are known to exist. Therefore we don't feel any further evaluation of this potential habitat loss is warranted.

(Responses to Comments 14:7 and 14:8 on Following Page)

13 FEB 1992
PINE WOODS CHAPTER
NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Pine Woods Audubon Society (James Puckett)

14:7 No soils which are classified as wetlands are proposed for maneuver use under any alternative. Development of maps at a level more detailed than that suggested will be a part of the site engineering analyses described in Section 1.4.

14:8 Comment noted. The exact locations of harvested stands will not be known until final site engineering studies are completed, but the consequences are estimated in some detail in Sections 3.3.2.3.1, 3.3.4.3.1, 3.5.10.2, and 3.5.10.3.

14:9 Comment noted.

10 February 1992

Mr. Tom Craven
Mobile District, Corps of Engineers
CESAM-PD-EI
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven,

Members of Pine Woods Chapter of the National Audubon Society met 6 February 1992 and passed by unanimous vote a Chapter Position Statement endorsing ALTERNATIVE 4, or "no change", in regard to the reissuance of a Special Use Permit for Mississippi National Guard use of the DeSoto National Forest. A copy of our Position Statement is enclosed, along with 23 questions/comments that we request be addressed in the Final EIS. Please call me (601/268-3863) or Tom Price (601/268-9129) if any clarification of the enclosed information is desired.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the preparation of a quality EIS.

Sincerely,

James F. Puckett

James F. Puckett, President
Pine Woods Audubon

14:9

PROPOSED POSITION STATEMENT

CAMP SHELBY DRAFT EIS

Pine Woods Audubon Society



1. The mission of the Pine Woods Audubon Society is identical with the mission of the National Audubon Society: protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat.

2. We are not opposed to military preparedness and military training, in its place.

3. We have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Military Training Use of National Forest lands near Camp Shelby, Mississippi. Though the best alternatives for the protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat are Alternatives 5 and 6, we have decided not to endorse them because they could entail a loss of several hundred jobs to south Mississippi citizens. We endorse Alternative 4 which essentially leaves Camp Shelby as it is today.

Questions and Concerns:

1. Pine Woods is unable to identify in the DEIS that the determination of no significant impact of proposed military training on Bachman's sparrow or Bewick's wren was made on documented information. According to data collected in 1978 and 1987 by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and analyzed in the 1989 "Breeding Bird Survey," 71% of eastern North American birds have significantly declined in population, with loss of habitat being assigned the chief cause. The availability of suitable habitat assumes critical importance for birds wintering in the SE United States as well as for trans-Gulf migrants. Alteration or loss of forest habitat in the SE may adversely affect the survival of species (such as those mentioned) wintering in the SE. Even cut-over lands managed for continued timber production may alter bird habitat for breeding and migration cycles.

In an effort to gauge better the impact of permanent clearing and thinning, for any and all action alternatives, on the process of bird decline, Pine Woods requests that the Final EIS include quantification of the cumulative total of acres of woodlands cleared or severely thinned (e.g., 10 trees/acre) in Forrest, Greene, George, Perry and Stone counties on an annual basis. An average for the years 1985-90 is suggested. This calculation should include, separately and in total, lands permanently cleared or thinned for development, e.g. highways, lakes, athletic courses, urban expansion, etc.; and those thinned or cleared for the timber industry on private and public lands. A comparison of these figures to that of the total wooded acres for these counties is requested. Pine Woods believes that this information is more likely to put in perspective the effect of the proposed action(s) on habitat loss.

2. Pine Woods is unimpressed with the argument advanced in the Draft EIS that clearing creates new habitat and increases wildlife diversity. We do not agree that "islands" of dense forest are better for wildlife than a natural forest. Studies at other military installations have shown large reduction of avian biomass when clearing took place and training areas were used over an extended period of time by tracked vehicles. Under plans 1 through 3, reductions in the populations of birds and small mammals would certainly come about as

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Pine Woods Audubon Society (James Puckett)

14:10 Comment noted.

14:11 Comment noted.

14:12 Comment noted.

14:13 Intensive surveys have been conducted specifically for the RCW, gopher tortoise, and the Camp Shelby burrowing crayfish in recent times. Other species of interest have been searched for, but to a lesser extent. Prior to the initiation of any construction activities, a site-specific environmental analysis will be conducted to search for, and assess impacts to wildlife and T&E species. Section 2.4.5 of the Final EIS presents the results of past and present surveys of the Camp Shelby area for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species, as do Appendices E, L, N, and Q.

14:14 The source for this type information is the Southern Forest Experiment Station most recent Forest Survey, 1987. This is published in the booklet *Forest Statistics for Mississippi Counties, (1987)*. Table 6, Area of Timberland by Stocking Class, should contain this type information. However, it shows no acres in the non-stocked class for Forrest, Greene, or Stone Counties. This is not reasonable. Therefore no attempt will be made to quantify the acres of woodland cleared in the five county area - Forrest, Greene, George, Perry, and Stone. A consideration of additional open area, in the ecological sense, has been added to Section 3.3.2.6 of the Final EIS.

14:15 The assertion that islands of dense forest are better than a natural forest was not advocated in the DEIS. In the DEIS, the benefits of tree islands were not compared against those provided by a natural forest. Rather, islands were deemed more environmentally acceptable relative to the uniform severe thinning scheme over large expanses that was originally proposed. The reasoning for this was that with uniform thinning of 30 X 30 feet or more, the entire thinned area has the greater potential for becoming all edge from an ecological standpoint. With some larger islands (greater than 50 acres) linked by riparian corridors, more of the interior species would likely be retained. Thus, like the thinning proposal described above, the concealment island concept described in the DEIS has also since been abandoned. See the several biodiversity sections in the FEIS for discussions regarding forest fragmentation and impacts to wildlife. See Sections 2.4.6 and 3.5.7 and the responses to comments 1:9 and 1:11.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Pine Woods Audubon Society (James Puckett)

PPS- 2

a result of a decrease in food resources associated with a reduction in the understory, as well as with a disruption of vegetative stratification and soil disturbances (3.2.2.4.1.). Woodland species such as Wood Thrushes and Bachman's Sparrows would be negatively impacted. It is little consolation to us that starlings and red-winged blackbirds might increase.

Pine Woods requests that the Final EIS include a breakdown showing bird species expected to increase, and those expected to decrease, as a result of clearing, thinning, and training activity proposed for Alternatives 1 through 3.

3. DEIS, Vol. I, Section 3, "Detailed Environment" maps for the proposed training areas, corridors and facilities/improvements. Identify sites of threatened, endangered, and sensitive species. Is the designation code "A" meant to indicate active gopher tortoise sites? If so, Pine Woods Audubon requests that the Final EIS correctly indicate these as endangered species sites.

4. At the Gopher Tortoise Council Meeting, October 1991, at Paul B. Johnson State Park, Ed Wester (Dept. of Zoology and Wildlife Science, Auburn University) identified the number of active gopher tortoise burrows on Camp Shelby as 912; whereas DEIS (L-1-4) lists the number as 514. Pine Woods Audubon requests that verification of this discrepancy, and of the colony count (39 in L-1-4) be published in the Final EIS.

5. Pine Woods Audubon finds no graphic representation in the DEIS by which to determine with confidence the boundary or burrow count of each of the 39 gopher tortoise colonies claimed in Appendix L to be present on the Camp Shelby installation. We feel this information is essential to the future monitoring of the environmental impact of any continued or additional military use of DeSoto National Forest lands, and request that this information be a part of the Final EIS.

6. Pine Woods Audubon requests that the EIS include provision for at least two civilians to be appointed to each of the monitoring teams assigned to gopher tortoises, red-cockaded woodpeckers, and lands treated for damage resulting from military training.

7. Pine Woods Audubon requests that the Final EIS indicate that the Conservation Recommendations identified in L-1-9 will be implemented as written, rather than as discretionary [emphasis added] as stated in the letter from John L. Sparks (L-2-1).

8. Pine Woods Audubon finds no mention in the DEIS of the RCW restoration program currently in operation in the DeSoto National Forest; nor of the importance of this effort to the overall RCW restoration program on USFS lands; nor of the significance of the potential loss of good RCW habitat to the national RCW restoration effort. We ask that this information be a part of the Final EIS.

9. Please identify in the Final EIS the guidelines, including the width of the buffer zone to be used around existing RCW cavity trees, for RCW management on USFS lands at Camp Shelby.

10. Pine Woods Audubon requests that the Final EIS include a thorough and detailed account of the disappearance of the last three red-cockaded woodpeckers from their colony in Forest Compartment 103 in Jan/Feb 1990, including the exact date of their disappearance, if known; the steps taken to determine the cause of the disappearance; and the conclusions reached in the course of this investigation.

14:16 The Final EIS now contains an estimate similar to that requested for 91 species of birds observed by the study teams at Camp Shelby during 1991 and 1992. The anticipated impacts to most of the 90 or so bird species observed on, or thought to occur on Camp Shelby (Appendix Q) has been included in Table 3-27, Section 3.3.2.4.1, of the FEIS.

14:17 Comment noted. The gopher tortoise is a federal and state threatened (not endangered) species. Some of the threatened and endangered species known to occur on Camp Shelby are more vulnerable to human predation than others. As it was necessary to show the locations of these species in order to support statements and conclusions in the text, giving them the same symbol was thought to provide at least some level of protection. The gopher tortoise is, of course, the most frequent threatened species present. It is not listed as endangered. RCW sites were not camouflaged primarily for two reasons. Forest Service records show no known active colonies on Camp Shelby. Secondly, RCWs, if present would tend to be more difficult to capture than terrestrial animals.

14:18 Comment noted. As a matter of policy, exact colony sites for certain species believed vulnerable to human intervention were not separately identified in the published materials. The gopher tortoise is, of course, the most frequent threatened species present. It is not listed as endangered. The 39 colonies and 514 active burrows cited in the 1989 biological opinion (page L-1-4 in the DEIS) were based on field surveys conducted for the 1988 assessment. The 912 active burrows Dr. Wester identified were the result of his field surveys completed after the 1988 assessment. Dr. Wester's findings were presented in his April of 1992 biological assessment, too late to be incorporated into the text of the Camp Shelby DEIS. The verbal presentation you cite took place while the DEIS was being printed. Dr. Wester was co-investigator on a second biological assessment published in 1990 which involved still more field work. Thus, there is actually no discrepancy, as you are referring to two assessments (1988 and 1992) which were based on two different surveys separated by approximately four years. In each case, the assessments were based on the most recent data available.

14:19 See the response to comment 14:18. The data you request are known. An exact, graphic emphasis of the colony boundaries and isolated burrows clearly labeling each site as gopher tortoise was not done for security purposes, because human predation is recognized a major factor in the decline of the tortoise, and the federal and state agencies involved felt that providing a road map to each active burrow would not be in the best interest of the tortoise. It is agreed that this information will form the basis for all monitoring of the tortoise by any entity. Please also see the response to comment 11:1 and 11:3.

14:20 Comment noted. An annual review of gopher tortoise management on Camp Shelby is held annually by the USFWS. There are no monitoring teams. The monitoring plan (Section 3.4.6) assigns responsibility for the monitoring of listed species to the USFS and USFWS.

14:21 Comment noted. The conservation recommendations identified in L-1-9 (DEIS) are being implemented as written by the Mississippi Army National Guard. The use of the term discretionary the USFS internal memo referred only to Forest Service actions in general forest management, not with specific relationship to any tortoise colony.
(Responses to 14:22, 14:23, and 14:24 on the Following Pages)

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Pine Woods Audubon Society (James Puckett)

14:22 RCW restoration efforts began in the mid 1970s with surveys, protection and designations of RCW cavity trees and colony sites. Active management strategies were outlined in the early 1980s with the direction provided in the Forest Service Handbook 2609.23K, Chapter 420. Establishment of foraging areas, recruitment and replacement stands and colony monumentation was carried out.

However, aggressive habitat management was not in full swing a decade or so ago because of a lack of funding related to the over all wildlife program. Beginning in the mid 1980s midstory removal work to maintain and improve RCW habitat began to take place. Before that time, most RCW work consisted of protection and some prescribed burning of the colony sites. By 1985, all of the remaining 5 active colony sites had been treated for midstory removal. At present, a total of 39 (mostly inactive and basically abandoned) colony sites have had midstory work completed.

In 1988, the Black Creek and Biloxi Ranger District began intensive monitoring work which included climbing trees, cavity inspections, placing restrictor plates over enlarged entrance holes, and dawn monitoring of historically active trees. As cavity inspections were completed, it was evident that the actual remaining RCW numbers were very low while competitor use of the RCW cavities was high.

In the fall of 1989, augmentation efforts were initiated on the Biloxi Ranger District of the De Soto National Forest. Augmentation is defined as the translocation of RCWs from one clan to another to help maintain breeding viability or improve genetic diversity. Currently, the Forest Service is limited to translocating only sub-adult females into single male colonies. The first yearling female was moved from the Vernon Ranger District on the Kisatchie National Forest and introduced to a single male on the Biloxi Ranger District in October, 1989. The two birds successfully pair bonded, mated in the summer of 1990 and fledged 2 young.

In November another female from the Vernon District was introduced to a single male on the Biloxi District and after a week, pair bonding was evident. However, these birds did not mate during the breeding season.

The third attempt at translocation occurred late in December. A female from the Apalachicola National Forest, in Florida, was released within a colony site with a single male on the Biloxi District but the female did not pair bond and her whereabouts is unknown.

The fourth augmented colony was on the Black Creek District. In late January, 1990, a female from the Apalachicola was released with a single male and a late nesting effort fledged one RCW.

Results of the first year's attempt of augmentation were fairly successful. Four birds translocated and 3 of these pair bonded; of these 3, two successfully nested and a total of 3 RCWs were fledged.

During January, 1991, two more yearling females from the Apalachicola were introduced to male RCWs on the Biloxi District. One was successful and the other pair did not bond. Also in 1990, the De Soto National Forest began installing artificial roost cavities (called inserts) for RCWs in locations where a shortage of natural roosting cavities was evident. By late summer 1991, 9 inserts were available for RCW use on the Forest (7 on the Biloxi, 2 on the Black Creek).

See responses to comments 1:3, 14:6, and 14:24 for additional information.

14:23 See additional coverage in Sections 3.1.2.5 and 3.2.1 of the Final EIS. A full copy of the *Implementation Guide for the Management of the Red-cockaded Woodpecker During the Interim Period* is available for review at the District Ranger's office in Wiggins, MS.
(Response to 14:24 on following page)

14:24 Colony 103-1 was first discovered in 1976 by Forest Service workers. The colony consisted of 2 active trees and habitat has been good to excellent ever since its discovery. The thinning in T-44 (tracked vehicle training area) to accommodate military training helped to create good foraging habitat for the RCWs. However, the closest other known colony site is over 3 miles away and interaction with other RCWs probably did not occur, resulting in isolation of the colony. In 1986, the colony's first successful nesting occurred. It is unknown if the nestling(s) fledged or not. In May of 1989, both parents were observed feeding one near-fledged nestling as artillery rounds were being fired overhead into the impact area. Despite this noise disturbance, this young was successfully raised and 3 RCWs were occupying the 2 tree colony. In June, 6 flying squirrels were removed from 2 cavities in one tree. There were still 2 RCWs roosting in the colony site. By April, 1990, all of the active roost cavities were inactive and periodically occupied by flying squirrels. Though a search of nearby suitable habitat was made the missing RCWs were not found.

The De Soto population occurs in longleaf pines within populations that are vulnerable because sub-populations are widely separated. This isolation combined with low numbers of active colonies that are widely scattered prevents the necessary exchange of genetic material needed to maintain a healthy population. Some colony sites were also troubled by cavity competitors and undesirable midstory vegetation. In the late 1970s, there were over 20 active colonies on the Black Creek Ranger District. Hurricane Frederick destroyed 9 active trees in 1979 and by 1983 the district only had 10 active colonies.

Burning of the longleaf forests on the De Soto created an open habitat, but a lack of older trees, pressure from more aggressive cavity users, and destruction from hurricanes over time have resulted in a very low RCW population.

The status of RCW active colony sites on the Black Creek Ranger District:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Active Colonies</u>
1983	10
1984	7
1985	5
1987	3
1988	4
1989	2
1990	1
1991	1
1992	1

There is no evidence to indicate that the RCW decline within the Camp Shelby Special-Use area has been significantly greater or lesser than those areas with colonies occurring in the general forest area where military training does not occur.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF Pine Woods Audubon Society (James Puckett)

PPS- 3

11. Pine Woods Audubon is concerned that any redefinition of "wetland," as is presently being considered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, might change the amount and configuration of DeSoto National Forest lands proposed for additional military training uses. Please address in the Final EIS how any change in wetlands definition will affect the proposed alternatives.

12. The DeSoto National Forest, with public assistance, is presently conducting a program entitled Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC), through which a long term management plan will be developed for the Wild & Scenic River and the Black Creek and Leaf River Wilderness Areas. Pine Woods finds no mention of the LAC program in the DEIS, and therefore no acknowledgement of potential conflicts in goals and purposes between this program and the proposed military training. Please address this deficiency in the Final EIS.

13. The DEIS does not address the impact of proposed action alternatives 1.2, 3A and 3B on the National Forest in Mississippi Management Plan. Until such impacts are analyzed and made public, with time for comment, the selection of any of these alternatives is indefensible.

14. Pine Woods Audubon believes the expansion of tracked vehicle training into the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area will do irreparable damage to the area. Wetlands will be lost or damaged; soil and water resources will be adversely affected; threatened and endangered species will be further threatened and endangered; forest-dwelling songbirds will be adversely affected. The DEIS contains no statement by the MS Fish & Wildlife Federation of the goals and objectives of the LRWMA, nor any assessment of how these elements will be met should the proposed expansion of military training into the LRWMA be approved. Please include this information in the Final EIS.

15. Pine Woods Audubon is deeply concerned that "budgetary and logistical problems have resulted in approximately 20 percent of the area needing treatment [due to environmental effects of action] going untreated." (DEIS 3.1.1.4) We are opposed to the creation of additional environmental damage until adequate money and logistical resources are secured to treat the effects of existing damage. Please demonstrate in the Final EIS, by documentation from the appropriate funding agency, that adequate "budgetary and logistical" resources are secure for treatment of areas affected by existing training and by proposed training.

16. There are two drainages presently used in the Camp Shelby installation. The demarcation between the Leaf River and Black Creek drainages is south of the northern perimeter of the present permit area. A large portion of the proposed maneuvering area drains into the Leaf River. Please explain why proposed maneuvering area drains into the Leaf River to be located only in the Black Creek drainage area. Please also explain, in the Final EIS, why heavy metal ions and aromatic hydrocarbons are not proposed to be monitored.

17. M2/M3 Bradley armor and A-10 ground support aircraft are capable of firing armor-piercing, depleted uranium cored projectiles. Pine Woods Audubon finds no mention of past or future use of these projectiles in the DEIS. Please address in the Final DEIS the past and future use of such ammunition.

14:25 The preparers' definition of wetlands was not ever contemplated to be changed from that generally recognized in 1989, and under which the National Wetlands Inventory was and is accomplished.

14:26 Additional material has been added to Section 3.1.3.4 which discusses the LAC system and its relation to military training. Further information on the LAC program is available at the District Ranger's office in Wiggins, MS.

14:27 The National Forests in Mississippi Land and Resource Management Plan was approved for implementation on September 16, 1985. The Mississippi Chapter of the Sierra Club appealed the September 16, 1985 Regional Forester decision of the Land and Resource Management Plan and accompanying Final Environmental Impact Statement. One of the appeal points raised was a concern over military use of National Forest administered lands. The effects upon outputs of goods and services of the current withdrawal of lands from multiple use management were analyzed at that time. The social and environmental effects of military use of National Forest administered land were not well discussed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Land and Resource Management Plan.

The need for additional analysis and disclosure of environmental impacts associated with military activities occurring on National Forest administered lands was identified. In an appeal agreement with the Mississippi Chapter of the Sierra Club, the Forest Service agreed to require that detailed environmental studies be conducted prior to modification of military activity levels. The Forest Service affirmed its position that expansion or change of military uses within the Special Use Permit area requires appropriate National Environmental Policy Act analysis and disclosure.

During the time that the Forest Service was addressing the Sierra Club appeal points, the National Guard Bureau of the Department of Defense published a notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement on the mission and use of Camp Shelby in the Federal Register on July 22, 1986 (pages 26290-26291). The Forest Service petitioned and was subsequently identified as a cooperating agency with the Department of Defense in the development of the Environmental Impact Statement.

The July 22, 1986 Notice of Intent was cited when the final administrative determination of the Department of Agriculture on the Sierra Club appeal was made on November 10, 1986. That Environmental Impact Statement was identified as the appropriate vehicle for the appellants to present their views as well as participate in planning for the area.

In its disposition of the Sierra Club appeal the Forest Service believed that the Environmental Impact Statement that was initiated in 1986 could serve as the appropriate National Environmental Policy Act disclosure document for the Special Use Permit Renewal decision that was scheduled for renewal in December of 1988. The Forest Supervisor determined that there was inadequate treatment of the effects of current ongoing activities and of cumulative impacts of all military activities occurring within the special use area in that Environmental Impact Statement (referred to as the Training Facilities EIS). Its relatively limited scope was not believed to satisfy National Environmental Policy Act requirements as the basis for the Special Use Permit renewal decision.

(Response 14:27 Continued on Next Page)

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Pine Woods Audubon Society (James Puckett)

(Continuation of Response 14:27) This Environmental Impact Statement has a broader scope than the Training Facilities FEIS. It will evaluate the environmental consequences of the present nature and level of military training activities at Camp Shelby; evaluate several new facilities; changes in training opportunities for armor and mechanized units; and the cumulative effects of all Army activities, past, present and proposed. It will be used by both the Forest Service and Department of Army in making decisions related to future use of Camp Shelby.

The Forest Service intends to use this Environmental Impact Statement as the National Environmental Policy Act disclosure document for the Special Use Permit decision. It also will be utilized for any associated Forest Plan amendment and/or revision decisions that may be required to implement the provisions of the Special Use Permit.

14:28 Comment Noted. The tank training activity has been designed to take place primarily on ridges with low soil erosion potential and to avoid wetland and low lying areas and habitats favored by threatened and endangered species. Any area exhibiting erosion damage, including the LRWMA, will be rehabilitated according to the Camp Shelby erosion control management plan. In addition, the ITAM program (Section 3.4) will be the primary instrument for land management and protection.

The LRWMA was originally developed to operate as a game propagation site (The Leaf River Development Project) in 1939 through lease agreements with the United States Forest Service. The mission, and name, of the Leaf River Development has changed according to its primary purpose. During most of its existence, the area was used to supply animals for a very successful trap and transfer program in Mississippi and was known as the Leaf River Refuge. This activity ceased in the late 1970s and the Leaf River Refuge was renamed the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area in 1982.

Please see the extensive additional coverage of the topics raised by the commentor throughout the Final EIS, including especially Sections 2.4.6.6, 3.3.1.4, 3.3.2.4, 3.3.2.5, and 3.3.6.

14:29 See response to comment 7:4.

14:30 Comment noted. Examination of the drainage patterns shows that almost all the areas proposed to be developed for maneuver purposes are in the Black Creek watershed. Almost all areas within the Leaf River watershed are already used for tracked vehicle maneuver, and no major changes are foreseen. Additional information on water quality monitoring is presented in Section 3.4.6.2 of the Final EIS (Sections 3.4.4.3 and 3.4.6.2 and Figure 3-66). Heavy metals and aromatic hydrocarbons were not considered likely contaminants, and have not been found in preliminary screening studies.

14:31 Depleted uranium ammunition has never been fired at Camp Shelby and its use is not planned in the future.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Pine Woods Audubon Society (James Puckett)

PPS- 4

<p>18. In "Alternatives Considered But Rejected" (DEIS 1.2.7) Pine Woods Audubon finds no evidence that DoD lands lying out-of-state received address as possible alternatives to DeSoto National Forest land. We consider this to constitute a failure of the DoD to fulfill its obligation to the Master Agreement between the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture (Weatherford & McDade, Ltd., 10-383). Please include an explanation in the Final EIS.</p> <p>Pine Woods Audubon acknowledges the "Alternatives for Operational Area Facilities" (Weatherford & McDade, Ltd., Final EIS, Executive Summary 9), but understands, as stated in that document, "it does not address the major expansion of armored unit maneuver areas which will be covered in subsequent analysis."</p> <p>19. Numerous recent media references (e.g., Clarion-Ledger, 1/12/92) call into question the future combat role of reserve and national guard forces. Pine Woods Audubon considers unconscionable the approval of any reconfigured training alternative until this role is made clear.</p> <p>20. In the DEIS, Vol. 1, Bibliography there are numerous ambiguous entries and omissions. Examples are the omission of the reference to Lynch & Speake (1978) concerning the effects of noise on the nesting behavior and productivity of the Eastern Wild Turkey, the reference to USDA Soil Conservation Service 1979 soil survey of Jones County cited several times for locations in Perry and Forrest counties, numerous draft reports and in-press publications (e.g., Severinghaus, W.D. and M.L. Denight, Environmental Awareness and Combat Training) which are unavailable to the public, and various other undated references. Pine Wood Audubon insists that documentation of the Final EIS be held to scrupulous standards and that each citation be correct and available to the public.</p> <p>21. Pine Woods Audubon understands that the justification for requiring a new Explosive Ordnance Disposal Facility is the classification of waste created by ordnance as hazardous, and that the location of the old facility on the impact area made difficult the monitoring of surface and ground water. Please state in the Final EIS whether the impact area, due to exploded and unexploded ordnance, is in part or in whole a hazardous waste site; and if not, why not?</p> <p>22. Please include in the Final EIS an itemized statement of the cost of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> preparation of DEIS printing of DEIS, total and per copy mailing of DEIS, total and per copy "scoping" meetings (Jackson, Hattiesburg, Gulfport), agency briefings, press conferences DEIS open house meetings, including materials preparation (Jackson, Hattiesburg, Gulfport) preparation of Final EIS printing of Final EIS, total and per copy mailing of Final EIS, total and per copy <p>While we acknowledge that this information may not facilitate the decision making process, we believe it should be available to the public.</p>	<p>14:32 The results of the study required by the Master Agreement are included in Section 1.2.9 of the Final EIS.</p> <p>14:33 The role of the National Guard has been recently clarified, and does include a significant heavy weapons responsibility. See Section 1.1.2.3 of the Final EIS and the response to comment 2:6.</p> <p>14:34 Comment noted. Every attempt has been made to revise and update the bibliography section to include all references made within the text, appropriate dates, etc. All citations should be accessible to the public either through interlibrary loan or by requesting the information directly from the organization. All the published Army research reports are unclassified and available to any library or member of the public through the National Technical Information Service.</p> <p>14:35 This situation is addressed in a United States Environmental Protection Agency memorandum dated September 19, 1988 addressed to all Hazardous Waste Branch Chiefs, Region I-X. The subject of the memorandum was: Questions and Answers Regarding the Handling of Explosives and Commercial Fuels. The memorandum used a scenario of an island which was used as a bombing range/impact area. It stated, in part: "Because there was no intent to discard the bombs, the island is not subject to RCRA. The same would apply at all types of ranges where the normal and expected use of a manufactured product has occurred."</p> <p>The Camp Shelby impact area is also used to detonate explosives during training. There is no intent to discard or dispose of the munitions used on the ranges served by the impact area. Therefore, the impact area is not regulated under the Mississippi Hazardous Waste Management Regulations or the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.</p> <p>14:36 Comment noted. The estimated total cost for all environmental documentation and associated actions over a period of 5 years, including many field studies whose results will be used for long term management, is approximately \$1,500,000. Inclusion of such data within the EIS is not a required or customary part of the NEPA process, whose requirements must be completed, regardless of cost.</p>
<p>14:32</p>	<p>14:32</p>
<p>14:33</p>	<p>14:33</p>
<p>14:34</p>	<p>14:34</p>
<p>14:35</p>	<p>14:35</p>
<p>14:36</p>	<p>14:36</p>

14:37 See additional coverage in new Sections 3.1.1.6, 3.4.9.1, and Appendix U and additional discussion has been added to Section 3.5.4.2.


23. Fire management in the DEIS is inadequately dealt with, in that there is no analysis of fire occurrence, acres burned, intensity of fire, source of ignition or fire prevention measures. Approximately 1/4 of all fires on the Black Creek Ranger District, and about 70% of the acres burned, are caused by military activities. All military caused fires should be kept at less than 10 acres and forces capable of accomplishing this should be on hand.

Pine Woods insists that a full analysis of the fire management conditions on area of the Special Use Permit be included in the Final EIS.

14:37

<p>5. Display on a map (scale: at least 2" = 1 mile) the location of all soils classified as being wet more than 3 months of the year and evaluate these soils capacity to support tank maneuvers.</p>	<p>14:38 See response to 14:7.</p>
<p>6. Compare the cumulative affects of the management of these lands for multiple use as practiced by the Forest Service, versus single use as a military training site.</p>	<p>14:39 Cumulative effects are examined in Section 3.5 of the FEIS. A wide variety of public uses will continue to be supported on all National Forest lands within the permit area, as described in Sections 3.1.3.4, 3.3.3.4, and 3.5.11.</p>
<p>7. Describe in detail the mitigating measures to be taken for the loss of recreational opportunities.</p>	<p>14:40 See response to Comment 14:39.</p>
<p>8. Evaluate the impact from any and all proposed uses of the 32,000 acres, on the Leaf Wilderness Area, Black Creek Wilderness Area, Black Creek Trail and Black Creek Scenic River from any and all proposed uses of the 32,000 acres.</p>	<p>14:41 No changes are predicted, under any alternative, to users of any of the wilderness areas, scenic river, or trail. All are well outside any area proposed for maneuver training under any alternative. Major sections have been added to the FEIS which cover the history of the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area, and the potential for effects on it of all alternatives.</p>
<p>9. Conduct an intensive survey of the 32,000 acres and of the surrounding acreage that might be affected by any and all operations, for archaeological sites, including resident and transient Native Americans, homes of greater than 50 years age, and family cemeteries. Describe in detail the protective measures to be provided these sites for any and all proposed uses.</p>	<p>14:42 Please see response to Comment 10:8. The required archeological preservation practices are outlined in the proposed Special Use Permit, Appendix A.</p>
<p>10. Do the analysis required by the Master Agreement between USDA and DOD substantiating that there are no other military reservations where the proposed type training can be done.</p>	<p>14:43 The analysis required under the Master Agreement has been performed, and a paragraph has been added to Section 1.2.9 which discusses the results.</p>
<p>11. Prepare an analysis of why the proposed tank training maneuvers cannot be done on the existing 50,000 acres of non-timber producing land west of Highway 29.</p>	<p>14:44 According to Forest Service records, there are approximately 39,100 acres withdrawn from full timber management within the permit area. This includes about 13,000 acres in the dedicated impact area and its buffer, and about 8,000 acres east of Highway 29. Thus, the total of all acreage available for maneuver use west of Highway 29 is no more than 20,000 acres before provision is made for protection of wetlands and threatened species. These are in scattered areas, many of which are closed when the tank main gun ranges are in use. This does not meet the training needs of the Mississippi National Guard, and formed the primary basis for the proposals to increase maneuver training capability (Section 1.1.2). Please also see general misconception statements 7 and 19, and the responses to comments 1:4 and 1:33.</p>
<p>12. Should the exchange take place the DeSoto NF will lose a large percentage of land from its "heart". Evaluate the impact on Forest Service management, in terms of cost and feasibility, on the remaining DeSoto NF lands.</p>	<p>14:45 Comment noted. Effects of the proposed action on forestry and the forest products industry are one of the major foci of the FEIS. See Sections 3.3.2.3, 3.3.4.3, and 3.5.4 and general misconception 12.</p>
<p>13. Evaluate the short and long term effect of river and stream siltation from the soil erosion resulting from tank maneuvers.</p>	<p>14:46 Extensive examination of potential soil losses is a part of both the Draft and Final EIS. See Sections 3.3.1.4, 3.3.1.5, 3.4.4, 3.4.5, 3.5.2, and 3.5.3.</p>
<p>14. Quantitate the volume loss of oxygen production due to unregenerated timber cutting on the 32,000 acres and evaluate its impact on clean air in the area.</p>	<p>14:47 Comment noted. Clearly, the percentage loss, if any, must represent infinitesimal fractions of one percent. In practice, the area to be cleared and thinned is to be replanted immediately with grasses and other groundcover species, whose photosynthetic rates are at least equal to those of forest species on a per acre basis.</p>

Doug Wolfe, President
Pine Woods Audubon Chapter,
National Audubon Society
Hattiesburg, Mississippi



ALABAMA AUDUBON COUNCIL

2616 Mountain Brook Parkway
Birmingham, Alabama 35223
February 21, 1992

Mr. Tom Craven
Mobile District, Corps of Engineers
CESM-PD-EI
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628

Re: Camp Shelby Draft EIS

Dear Sir:

I am writing on behalf of Birmingham, Mobile Bay, Shoals, Tennessee Valley, and Tuscaloosa Audubon Societies, which comprise the Alabama Audubon Council and represent some 4,000 members in Alabama. Our annual members' meeting was held recently in Ocean Springs, Mississippi, and we became familiar at that time with the Camp Shelby Draft EIS. Various members have taken extended canoeing trips over the years on Black Creek and the Leaf River downstream from Hattiesburg and thus are interested in the area.

We are concerned that the Draft EIS does not adequately address impacts on the recreational values of the river basins involved and on endangered species, particularly the Red-cockaded Woodpecker, Bachman's Sparrow, and Gopher Tortoise. For example, a circle of one-fourth mile radius, or 125 acres, that in the past has been used by the U. S. Forest Service has been proven not to be enough to maintain a Red-cockaded colony. In addition, certain conservation recommendations, such as those listed in Appendix L, appear to be discretionary, not mandatory.

As you know, the proposed revisions to the 1989 Wetlands Delineation Manual are very controversial and not scientific. Consequently, those revisions should not be used in the EIS, especially since publicly-owned lands are at issue.

On a larger question, we believe the military should reassess its proposed alterations of Camp Shelby property which have such devastating environmental impacts. Changes which have recently taken place on the international scene, projected cuts in our military budgets, and a probable shift in the importance of the proposed military activities when compared to their impacts on endangered species, wetlands, and recreation should indicate a change in overall use of the base. We urge that you make such a reassessment in addition to addressing deficiencies in the Draft EIS raised by others.

Sincerely,

Alabama Audubon Council

Elberta G. Reid
Elberta G. Reid, President

For the Conservation and Appreciation of Wildlife and Wilderness, Natural Resources and Natural Beauty

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF Alabama Audubon Council (Elberta Reid)

15:1 See Sections 3.3.3.4 and 3.5.11 in the FEIS for a revised discussion on the potential for impacts to recreation. Impacts to the RCW and gopher tortoise are discussed in Sections 3.1.2.5, 3.3.2.5, and 3.5.6 of the FEIS. The Bachman's sparrow (*Aimophila aestivalis*) is designated as a Forest Service Sensitive species, and is not Federally listed, but is discussed in Sections 2.4.5.1.5 and 3.3.2.4.1, where the increase in forest openings suggests more favorable conditions may prevail. If you mean to refer to Bachman's Warbler, this bird has not been observed in the area in decades, and may be extinct.

15:2 Comment noted. For a variety of reasons, preparers have not ever contemplated changing definition of wetlands to any of the revised versions. The 1989 definitions as used by the National Wetlands Inventory are used throughout when calculating wetlands area in both the Draft and Final EIS.

15:3 Comment noted.

15:4 Comment noted. Please see the response to comment 1:6 and general misconception statement 8.

15:1

15:2

15:3

15:4




P.O. BOX 1814
JACKSON, MS 39215-1814
The Official State Affiliate of the
National Wildlife Federation

STATE-WIDE AFFILIATES

- DELTA
- 82 Conservation Association
 - Mid-South Beagle
 - Cundoo Association
 - Mississippi Association of Conservation Districts
 - Mississippi B.A.S.S. Federation
 - Mississippi Bowhunters Association
 - Mississippi Chapter, American Society of Landscape Architects
 - Mississippi Chapter, Gulf Coast Conservation Association
 - Mississippi Chapter, National Wild Turkey Federation
 - Mississippi Chapter, The Wildlife Society
 - Mississippi Forestry Association
 - Mississippi Ornithological Society
 - Mississippi Society of American Foresters
 - Mississippi State Rifle & Pistol Association
 - Mississippi Still Hunters Association
 - Mississippi Traditional Archery Association
 - Mississippi Trappers Association

Phone: (601) 353-6922
FAX: (601) 352-3437



Protecting Our Environment

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mississippi Wildlife Federation (Elizabeth Rooks)

February 28, 1992

Department of the Army
Mobile District Corps of Engineers
Inland Environment Section
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001
Attn: Mr. Tom Craven

Dear Mr. Craven:

On behalf of the 20,000 individual and affiliate members of the Mississippi Wildlife Federation citizens' conservation organization, I wish to offer the following comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Military Training Use of National Forest Lands at Camp Shelby, Mississippi. Please find enclosed a resolution passed by the MWF membership on February 8, 1992 concerning the proposed reconfiguration of the training area at Camp Shelby. From the resolution, it is evident that we have two primary concerns: the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area, and the proposed mitigation -- ITAM.

MWF is opposed to any intrusion of military training into the state-owned lands of the Leaf River Game Management Area. On page F-19 of Appendix F of the DEIS, you state that if all maneuvering in the Leaf GMA is prevented, it will have some benefit for a large number of respondents to the recreational survey you conducted. Your survey also indicated that hunting is the most popular recreational activity in the Camp Shelby area. We are concerned that if your preferred alternative is implemented, that lands for hunting and other outdoor recreational opportunities in the GMA will be permanently lost to public use because of drastic measures such as clearcutting several thousand acres over a five year period and the impact of tracked vehicle traffic in the GMA (soil erosion and compaction, loss of vegetative cover, emigration of fauna, noise pollution, loss of aesthetic appeal). We are also disappointed in the nature of the Part II of the recreational study where a self-selection process was used. The results of the study cannot be considered conclusive or truly scientific, and do not provide enough information about public usage of the Leaf River GMA or of any of the public lands in the Camp Shelby area. We request that the Corps revisit this portion of the DEIS and conduct further study on the visitation and recreational activity preferences for the GMA and the De Soto National Forest.

We know in the past that black bear have been

16:1 Comment noted. All areas proposed for use are National Forest lands, and are not owned by the State of Mississippi. Please see Section 2.4.6 of the FEIS.

16:2 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 4, 9, and 14. Refer to response to Comment 14:28. All areas will be available for public utilization when training exercises are not occurring at Camp Shelby, as is the case for training lands currently in use. The topics you raise are among those upon which the studies for this EIS have been focused.

The ITAM program (Section 3.4.1) will be implemented to direct training, resource management, rehabilitation, and mitigative measures to minimize the impact of training activities. It should also be noted that the LRWMA is dominated by longleaf pine (55%) and that the majority of longleaf pine (> 70%) is in the saw timber stage. This indicates that timber harvest will continue at normal rates under regular USFS schedules.

16:3 Comment noted. Preparers believe the survey was adequate for the use intended. Extensive public comment has since been received which reinforces the majority of the conclusions and observations first presented in the study. Coverage of recreation and especially hunting opportunity has been expanded in the Final EIS.

16:4 See response to comment 16:3.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mississippi Wildlife Federation (Elizabeth Rooks)

Page 2

sighted in the Leaf River GMA, and just recently in the Black Creek area and other places around Perry County. In Section 2.4.5.1. you should amend the statement about black bear as a state endangered species, as it is now on the federal threatened species list as well. I also would encourage you to anticipate the listing of critical habitat for the Louisiana black bear in the area in and surrounding Camp Shelby.

We are also concerned about the implementation of ITAM as the mitigation measure for the Army's preferred alternative. Number 2 Under ITAM's list of goals for implementation is to "Conserve and enhance natural resources." We were recently told by Army Corps of Engineers representatives that "to enhance" is not part of their policy. Their instructions are to restore, but not to enhance. Has the Army changed its policy? Or is the Army's policy inconsistent throughout the department? The DEIS describes generally how ITAM is structured, but it does not, to our satisfaction, address specific mitigation needs for any of the structural alternatives. We realize that this is a long-term, stratified program, but we are not convinced that ITAM is sufficient as a mitigation measure.

The Land Use Requirements Study in Appendix K cites a deficiency in the amount of tracked maneuver acreage at Camp Shelby, stating: "The combat readiness of the three (3) Armored Brigades that train at Camp Shelby are certainly affected by this deficiency. Battalion-level training is the most critical requirement for sustaining combat arms readiness. The present constraints placed on these units due to the lack of track maneuver area, forces them to train at Platoon and Company level." However, the General Accounting Office Report B-244872 dated September 24, 1991 which discusses the training and preparedness of the 155th at Camp Shelby is not consistent with the statement "Battalion-level training is the most critical requirement for sustaining combat arms readiness." The GAO report indicated other non-land use related problems such as:

1. A large number of soldiers had not been completely trained during peacetime to do their assigned jobs when called to active duty during the Persian Gulf War.
2. The training was not realistic (crews were too familiar with old, outdated firing ranges).
3. Non-commissioned officers lacked leadership skill and job knowledge to train their soldiers.
4. The National Guard did not make the transition to the active Army's administrative system well, and consequently made mistakes such as ordering old M-60 tank parts for the brigades' newer M-1 tanks.
5. Thirty-three percent of the soldiers had dental conditions or incomplete dental records that prevented them from being deployable. Other guardsmen over 40 years of age, suffered from chronic medical conditions.
6. And, brigades were grossly underestimating the time needed for post-mobilization training. (The executive summary is enclosed).

16:5 Comment noted. The Louisiana black bear is discussed in Section 2.4.5.1.2 of the Final EIS.

16:5

16:6 Comment noted. Yes, it is a goal of ITAM to enhance natural resources when the resource in question is encountered in a degraded or unacceptable condition. No, it is not a goal to enhance all resources, regardless of present status. While this may seem a conflicting position, it is functional in practice. Since it is recognized in this comment that ITAM is a *process*, rather than a single action, any actions taken to minimize environmental damage may be defined into it. Each separate mitigation need becomes a part of the process, as required to effect the protective measure at hand.

16:6

16:7 Please see the response to comment 2:6. At least three, if not four, of the elements included on your list would be enhanced through addition of improved training facilities and maneuver areas.

16:7

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mississippi Wildlife Federation (Elizabeth Rooks)

Page 3

The GAO made several recommendations. But the need for battalion level training was not listed as critical, or even absolutely necessary in this report. In fact, the findings of the GAO report coupled with the recent defense budget cutting and base closure measures by Congress, causes us to question the need for battalion level training at Camp Shelby. We understand that the Secretary of the Army does not agree with all the GAO findings; however, we do believe those findings should be included in the "Need for the Action" section of the Final EIS and maybe in the Appendix, "in toto."

Plant, bird and animal species are list in Appendix Q and are referred to in Sections 2.4.1. and 2.4.4. From the list it appears that few or no recent ground studies were conducted for this DEIS. We do understand that some indepth studies were or are being planned pending the comments received on the DEIS. The information appears to have been taken from the previous EIS and from studies by other resource agencies and research institutions. We request that the Corps enlist the assistance of the other resource agencies to conduct a thorough and contemporary survey of the flora and fauna in the Camp Shelby reservation.

Finally, we continue to question the exclusion of the Camp Shelby from the Secretary of Defense moratorium issued almost two years ago on military land expansions. We understand that you prefer not to refer to this case as an expansion, but rather a reconfiguration of the training area. But the fact is, the physical training area is being expanded through a revised special use permit. In the moratorium dated September 13, 1990, the Secretary of Defense stated: "... I am establishing a moratorium on such acquisitions. Effective immediately, no action shall be taken without my approval (including Records of Decision for an Environmental Impact Statement) to accomplish a major land acquisition....Major land acquisition is defined for the purposes of this memorandum as the purchase, withdrawal from public domain, lease or permit from individuals or government entities, or any other type of use agreement involving more than 1,000 acres, or land whose estimated purchase price or annual lease price exceeds \$1 million." Please indicate in the final EIS why, when and where the distinction between this and other special use permits was made.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this document. We look forward to seeing the revised document.

Sincerely,



Elizabeth Rooks
Executive Director
Mississippi Wildlife Federation

Enclosures

4 Page Enclosure (GAO Report Summary)
Not Reproduced in this FEIS.

16:8

16:8 Please see response to comment 2:6.

16:9 Comprehensive surface studies have been performed for most of the resources in question. The species lists in Appendix Q are largely actually the results of field surveys, not secondary reportage, except where so noted. Also, in conjunction with the Army's LCTA program, a comprehensive floristic inventory of Camp Shelby was conducted over a two year period (1990/1991) in which T&E species were included. In addition, see the response to comment 14:13.

16:10 No expansion of training area beyond the boundaries of the present permit area is sought under any alternative, nor is acquisition of land title. The special use permit, being a renewal of an existing permit, has not been interpreted as an acquisition. The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Logistics provided guidance, shortly after Secretary Atwood's declaration of a moratorium, that the EIS studies for Camp Shelby were specifically allowed to continue.

16:11 See response to comment 16:10

16:9

16:10

16:11

Page 4

cc:

Senator Trent Lott
Senator Thad Cochran
Representative Jamie Whitten
Representative Sonny Montgomery
Representative Gene Taylor
Ken Johnson, Forest Supervisor
Jack Herring, NDWFP Executive Director
Jay Hair, National Wildlife Federation
Mississippi Chapter, Sierra Club
Major Bob Lee, MS Army National Guard
MWF Executive Committee
Danny McDaniel, General Counsel

Page Intentionally Left Blank

Adopted 1992

CAMP SHELBY SPECIAL USE PERMIT

PL 9

Whereas, timber and other habitat types, wildlife and aquatic life and recreational opportunities in the area of the proposed reconfiguring of lands for military training within the DeSoto National Forest are valuable to the citizens of the state of Mississippi, and

Whereas, the demand for quality outdoor recreation areas in Mississippi is increasing each year, and

Whereas, the area under consideration is currently managed by the U.S. Forest Service using a multiple use management strategy and is used by the citizens of Mississippi for a multitude of outdoor recreational activities, and

Whereas, activities resulting from the proposed action would cause erosion and sedimentation problems, and would overall adversely affect soil and water resources, and

Whereas, tank maneuvering will do serious longterm damage to wetlands and drylands, and

Whereas, due to the current global political climate and relative peace among nations, the President of the United States has made a commitment to reduce the defense budget, thus substantially changing current military posture, and

Whereas, the need for a battalion level maneuvering area at Camp Shelby has not been clearly established,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Mississippi Wildlife Federation opposes any intrusion for tank maneuvers into the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area, and

Be it further resolved that whatever intrusion occurs, without supporting any alternative proposed in the Draft

Environmental Impact Statement for the reconfiguration, the Mississippi Wildlife Federation demands sufficient, concurrently funded mitigation and sufficient, ongoing restoration to restore the ecological balance.

Resolution adopted by the Mississippi Wildlife Federation this 8th day of February, 1992.

Responses to Comments 16:1 and 16:2 earlier in this section.

16:1

16:2



SIERRA CLUB LEGAL DEFENSE FUND, INC.

The Law Firm for the Environmental Movement

400 Magazine Street, Suite 401 New Orleans, LA 70130 (504) 522-1194 FAX (504) 566-7142

LOUISIANA OFFICE
Nathalie M. Walker
Managing Attorney
Robert B. Wiygul
Staff Attorney

Sharon Carr Harrington
Community Liaison Director
Vanessa B. Amstrong
Office Manager

HOME OFFICE
San Francisco, California

REGIONAL OFFICES
Denver, Colorado
Honolulu, Hawaii
Juneau, Alaska
Seattle, Washington
Tallahassee, Florida
Washington, D.C.

February 28, 1992

Ref: 837

Mr. Thomas Craven
United States Army Corps of Engineers
Mobile District
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile AL 36628-0001

RE: DEIS on Use of Desoto
National Forest by the
Mississippi Army
National Guard

Dear Mr. Craven:

These comments on the above-captioned Draft
Environmental Impact Statement are submitted on
behalf of the Mississippi Chapter of the Sierra Club
and Stop the Land Swap. As you may be aware, these
organizations, which represent citizens across
Mississippi, object most strenuously to the takeover
of additional national forest lands for use by
tracked vehicles. Consequently, these comments will
focus on this critical issue.

First, as a matter of methodology the DEIS does
not comport with the regulations of the Council on
Environmental Quality. The CEQ regulations governing

17:1 Comment noted.

17:2 Comment noted. Preparers believe that the documentation of sources has been
improved in the Final EIS. There will remain, however, differences in interpretation
of source material and in professional judgement as to the value and importance of
many observations. Some disagreement may, therefore, be unavoidable.



a member of Earth Share

Camp Shelby
February 28, 1992
Page 2

the preparation of Environmental Impact Statements state that in preparing an EIS the agency "shall identify any methodologies used and shall make explicit reference by footnote to scientific and other sources relied upon for the conclusion to the statement." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.24. Throughout the DEIS there are numerous assertions of fact that are not cited to sources, and numerous conclusions of fact that are likewise not cited to authority.

In addition, for most of the conclusions, no methodology is supplied, and the reader is essentially left to guess how the Corps arrived at the conclusion. Virtually every page of the DEIS dealing with the projected impacts of the proposed action contains statements of this sort. An example is page 3-88, in which the DEIS states that "having distinct woodland and grassland communities is more desirable from a biodiversity viewpoint than having the entire area dominated by edge species." This statement could be correct for some hypothetical area, but how are we to know it is correct for the area in question? Without the methods and information used to arrive at this conclusion, it is impossible to tell whether it is accurate or simply, as it appears to be, wishful thinking on the part of the Corps.

The CEQ's regulations also provide very specific guidance concerning the treatment of scientific uncertainty in an EIS. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22 specifically provides that when "there are gaps

17:3 Comment noted. Please see the response to comment 17:2.

17:2

17:3

Camp Shelby
February 28, 1992
Page 3

on relevant information or scientific uncertainty, the agency shall always make clear that information is lacking or that uncertainty exists." In a number of areas the DEIS glosses over or fails to acknowledge the existence of scientific uncertainty or the gaps in relevant information concerning the impacts of construction of the facilities proposed. An example is page 2-16, in which the DEIS states both that the effect of military noise on wildlife at Camp Shelby is unknown, and that wildlife have "undoubtedly" become habituated to military noises. This section is later relied upon on page 3-80 to positively state that many species have become habituated to military activity. This type of shoddy and self-contradictory analysis is a clear breach of CEQ regulations, and is repeated throughout the DEIS.

In other cases, the conclusions reached seem to ignore the rest of the DEIS in favor of concluding that the proposed activity will have no negative impacts. For example, on page 3-128 the DEIS states that there will be no cumulative effect on wetlands or surface waters. Yet, page 3-103 states that transport of silt from training areas is currently causing wetlands to fill, with attendant adverse effects on trees. Use of tracked vehicles is also admitted on page 3-127 to cause erosion. In addition, it is clear from pages 3-103 - 105 that buffer strips like those proposed to protect wetlands do not filter out sediment. Given these admitted facts, the idea that there will be no cumulative effects - indeed, that there will not

17:4 Comment noted. Please see the response to comment 17:2.

17:5 Comment noted. Preparers note that there are many cases in which adverse short-term effects must be acknowledged, but there are few *significant, irrevocable, long-term* effects. This may be the origin for commentator's source of "no negative impacts."

17:4

17:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund, Inc. (Robert Wiygul)

Camp Shelby
February 28, 1992
Page 4

be immediate, direct and serious effects on wetlands and surface waters - is ludicrous.

Likewise, the conclusion reached that alternative 1 will have positive effects on wildlife habitat, page 4-7, is fundamentally rather silly given that all available information indicates that use of areas for training will decrease species populations, pages 3-81-82. Indeed, virtually all of the conclusions reached seem to ignore the real evidence of impacts in favor of a totally unsupported guess that the favored alternative will either be neutral or negative. In sum, this DEIS seems calculated to justify the favored alternative regardless of the evidence.

One other point should be noted. The acreage available for tracked vehicle maneuvers is tens of thousands of acres less than that called for by the mission statement referenced in the EIS. Adding buffer zones around wetland areas will reduce this acreage still further. It appears that the objective is to get additional maneuver area - any additional maneuver area - without regard to whether that area will be sufficient. The DEIS should contain a complete explanation of why the reduced acreage is feasible, and must indicate the final usable acreage assuming adequate buffer zones around all sensitive areas.

Finally, the DEIS contains no explanation why the massive change in use of national forest lands does not require an amendment to the forest plan for the DeSoto National Forest.

17:6

17:6 An interagency committee, including representatives from major commenting agencies, has agreed upon a revised definition for biodiversity, which is used through the Final EIS. Please see Sections 1.2.1.4.3, 2.4.7, 3.3.2.6.1, and 3.5.7 of the Final EIS and responses to comments 2:371 and 3:25.

17:7 Comment noted. The purpose of this EIS, in accordance with 40 CFR 1502.1, is the evaluation of alternative ways to perform a proposed action, and the presentation of those results to the public and to the decision maker. If the preferred alternative may be planned so as to be implemented without significant, long term, adverse consequences, then the NEPA process has served its purpose. In practice, many aspects of recreation availability, soil loss, and listed species management were measurably expanded in coverage as a result of public and agency comments on the Draft EIS.

17:7

17:8 Although the acreage available at Camp Shelby does not meet the optimum suggested amount, sufficient acreage is available to conduct battalion level task force training. Training Circular 25-1, Training Land, states that the desired maneuver box is 8,000 X 31,000 meters (about 5 miles by 19 miles). Alternative 1 meets this requirement very well, even though much of the acreage is not available for maneuver. Even if all acreage were to be available for maneuver, much of the acreage would not actually contain tracked vehicle traffic. Training Circular 25-1 also states "The actual nature of specific terrain may argue in favor of using more or less land. The information provided is intended only as a guide. With these figures as a guide, it is up to the trainer to evaluate actual land requirements to support training at a specific location." While reconfiguration of maneuver areas will not alleviate the nominal acreage shortfall, consultation with the three Armored Brigades reveals that it will allow them to train to standard at Battalion level on their required tasks.

17:8

17:9 Please see response to comment 14:27.


17:9

Camp Shelby
February 28, 1992
Page 5

Clearly the impacts on timber, recreation, and wildlife will legally require such an amendment, with all the attendant public notice and comment. The DEIS should address the means of complying with the forest plan amendment process.

In sum, this DEIS has more problems than one person can readily spend the time to address. It is in fact little more than a "puff piece" for the proposed action, playing down or ignoring negative impacts. We trust that these faults will be cured prior to finalizing the statement.

Very truly yours,



Robert B. Wiygul

cc: Mr. Louie Miller
Mr. Pete Denton

17:9

Response to Comment 17:9 on Previous Page

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Eugene Abernathy

34 Williamsburg
Abernathy, Mr. 10 JAN REC'D
6 January 1992

Dear Mr. Cranston:

I believe that the preservation of
the Leaf River Wildlife Management
Area is important to many in the Ball,
Mississippi. I am sure by now that
the new land manager area does
not infringe upon its boundaries.

Yours truly,
E. G. Oliver
R-1

18:1 Comment noted. The Leaf River Wildlife Management Area (LRWMA) is
recognized as an important asset in south Mississippi. Preservation implies that the
area will be maintained in its current ecological state. This would not occur even if
tracked vehicle training were not to take place in the LRWMA. Please also refer to
the response to comment 16:2 and misconceptions 10 and 14.

18:1

19:1 Comment noted. Numerous additional studies have been performed in the time since the Draft EIS was circulated, and many additions and refinements made to the Final EIS.

Rt. 1 Box 342 AD
Cathlamet, WA 98051
April 10, 1992

Mobile Env. US Corp of En.
Attn: Thomas M. Brown
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile AL 36628-0001

Dear Sir,

I am a Concern Citizen of the U.S.A. We are well traveled over this great Country of ours and we see so many things that all of us need to take account when we began to destroy our Natural Resources.

Before any further decisions are made concerning ^{Desoto National Forest} we should give more study & defer any changes at Camp Shiloh, Mo.

Sincerely
Mrs. Aubrey S. Adams

19:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

James Alexander

James Alexander
15509 Joan D'Arc
Biloxi, MS 39532
(601) 392-0894

20:1 Comment noted. Please see misconception 8, and the responses to comment 2:6.

20:2 Comment noted. The proponent is the Mississippi Army National Guard, and both proponent and preparers have striven to present a full set of potential problems associated with the proposed action.

20:3 See response to comments 1:4 and 1:33.

20:11 The rate of harvest of timber to be removed has been specifically identified as a concern in Section 3.3.2.3, and its mitigation, proposed in Section 3.4.9, is to spread the harvest over at least four years.

Comments 20:4 and 20:5 appear on page 2 of Mr. Alexander's letter

20:4 Comment noted. Please refer to Misconception 23 and the response to Comments 14:28 and 16:2. The LRWMA is not being taken over by Mississippi National Guard training activities.

20:5 This topic is now covered in Section 3.1.1.3.5 of the Final EIS. The Environmental Awareness Program at Camp Shelby is designed to inform soldiers of the environmental consequences of petroleum product spills. Prior to any training activity at Camp Shelby, units are briefed on the policies and procedures for spill prevention and further required by regulation to maintain and operate their equipment in a state of repair that prevents spills and leaks. Camp Shelby has in place a spill prevention, control, and counter-measures plan and an installation spill contingency plan in accordance with AR 200-1 and 40 CFR 112. These plans address actions required to prevent accidental release of petroleum products into the environment and address containment, counter-measures, and reporting procedures in the event of their accidental release. The Directorate of Facilities Engineering maintains the necessary equipment and personnel for spill containment and clean-up.

To discharge the effluent from a Tank Wash Facility to the waters of the State of Mississippi requires a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). Camp Shelby currently has a NPDES permit for its Tank Wash Facility which mandates limits on the concentrations of oil and grease that may be discharged to the environment. Camp Shelby conducts compliance monitoring sampling in addition to sampling done by DEQ to document compliance with permit limits. A new Tank Wash Facility (which is proposed to be built in the cantonment area rather than the maneuver area) would require the issuance of an additional NPDES permit.

Dear Mr. Thomas M. Craven,

It should be quite apparent to anyone taking the time to review the facts that once again, "they" that is the government (i.e. Federal, state, county) is reflecting a total disregard for the will of the people. The subject I am concerned with in this case is the U.S. Army's takeover of the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area and other associated National Forest Lands.

This takeover was not necessary in 1989 and most definitely is not a requirement at present, especially in light of the dramatic changes in the U.S.S.R. With the present defense cut backs (to wit, the loss of my job at the MS Army Ammunition in the spring of 1990 due to it's closure), it is unconscionable that the military should go ahead with this proposal.

What really concerns me is the apathy expressed by the general public when blatantly irresponsible leadership and management practices are shown by our elected officials. How far are we willing to allow conditions and our basic quality of life to deteriorate?

-The draft EIS for this planned expansion, though impressive both in volume and in content, was after all composed by the Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Army's stepsister and reads as such. That is to say that most all environmental concerns addressed are not truthfully stated as to the impact of this rape on our forest lands.

I have enjoyed the usage of DeSoto National Forest and more specifically Leaf River Wildlife Management Area (LRWMA) for the past 22+ years. I feel quite qualified in stating that this area and it's ecosystem is far too environmentally sensitive to sustain the planned usage by the military. The existence of these National Forests in their present condition is one of the prime reasons my wife and I, lifelong residents of Mississippi, remain Mississippians.

-It is quite apparent to myself that the main reason for the military's insistence that Alternative 3B is not viable is simple greed. That area presently used by the military is inadequate regarding training due to the military's destruction of that area. This mentality is reminiscent of that in South America and other developing countries where "slash and burn" methods are utilized. The real losers sadly are our children and future generations. My belief is that the people responsible, whatever the outcome, shall be answerable to a higher authority one day.

-It is true that the timber glut caused by the dumping of this large amount of product on the market will be felt by small landowners as well as some larger. Not to worry though because the larger corporations whom keep our "elected" officials in office shall profit nicely by this bargain timber.

20:1

20:2

20:3

20:11

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

James Alexander

20:6 No pollution of this nature is anticipated, due to the difference in the nature of the activities involved. Please see Sections 3.2.2, 3.4.6.2 and 3.5.3.1 for a discussion of the water quality monitoring actions proposed.

20:7 The Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks has that responsibility on all National Forest and Department of Defense lands, including the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area. Forest Service law enforcement personnel will assist them when requested. The Mississippi Military Department has that responsibility on their lands within the Cantonment Area.

20:8 Comment noted. Through the functioning of the NEPA process, the potential for environmental impact has been made known to the public.

20:9 Comment noted. Preparers note that continued public access is a goal for both the National Guard and the Forest Service. Restrictions on access are limited to those times when tank main gun firing, or aerial gunnery firing, are actually taking place. The range firing fans are closed to all human entrance for safety requirements when this takes place. See also response to comments 3:31 and 4:3. While directed primarily toward hunting access, reference to misconception 4 in Section 1, Volume III of the Final EIS may help to show how access is planned to be accommodated.

20:10 Comment noted.

20:4 - LRMWA is an intensively managed wildlife area with all credit due to the MS Department of Conservation and the Forestry Service. This did not happen overnight nor can the damages caused by this takeover be "mitigated" short term as one is made to believe by the EIS. The EIS does not address the leakage of fuel, oil or other hydraulic fluids caused by vehicles while traversing the area. The same for the tank wash and the effects of these contaminants on the watershed. With the litigation between the New Augusta forest products plant and landowners, is the federal government prepared for more of the same regarding the expected pollution of Black Creek and Leaf River? Who will have responsibility for law enforcement as regards any wildlife or fisheries resources that may remain after clearcutting and subsequent tank maneuvers? What "deal" has been struck between our elected officials (i.e. Lott, Taylor and especially Montgomery) that they whole heartily endorse this confiscation of public property without concern for public opinion? Will their gain outweigh our loss? Though I was advised verbally that access into the area shall not be limited even while training is in progress, how about some guarantees? As is readily apparent, I am totally against this infringement on my and my children's birthright. For once, how about some honesty and responsible action by those in power and with whom we the people have entrusted control of our's and future generation's destiny.

Sincerely,

James Alexander
James Alexander

2-19-92

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Kathy Allday

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am writing this letter to voice my opposition to the expansion of tank training facilities at Camp Shelby and the inevitable destruction of the DeSoto

National Forest.

The most recent Environmental Impact Study listed

several of the following:

1. Loss of timber revenue by massive clear-cutting.
2. Damage to animal and plant ecosystems.
3. Noise pollution
4. Loss of forestry related jobs.
5. Diminished quality of life
6. Reduction in military spending especially M-1 Tank
7. Loss of recreational facilities.

There is no established mission or need for this

expansion at the above costs. PLEASE STOP THIS EXPANSION NOW!!!!!!

Sincerely,

Kathy Allday
KTH For 6350

CV226 77125 39464

21:1 Comment noted.

21:2 Please see additional coverage in the Final EIS (Section 3.3.2.1 and Tables 3-23 through 3-26). It is important to remember that comparisons are made to the current status, approximately equal to Alternative 4, in which there are large acreages of timbered land already set aside for tank maneuvers. These are not currently available for timber sales but, depending upon the alternative selected, will be harvested during project implementation or returned to normal National Forest management. To a large degree, this offsets the effects of the lack of future production from newly cleared maneuver areas for the first 40 years following implementation.

21:3 Some changes to plant and animal communities are inevitable if any alternative is selected. The nature and degree of change was examined extensively in both the Draft and Final EIS. The proponents believe that great care has been taken in planning proposed changes to avoid effects on threatened and endangered species, and to minimize effects on sensitive areas such as wetlands. Further, none of the development of proposed tracked vehicle maneuver areas would represent permanent change, in that forest cover could be reestablished on the areas whenever desired, and in time almost no trace of the maneuver activities be observed. An area of almost 500,000 acres was used for training during World War II, and effects of maneuvers have essentially disappeared through natural processes. Please also see Sections 3.1.2, 3.3.2, 3.5.1, 3.5.5, and 3.5.7 of the Final EIS.

21:4 Noise from heavy weapons firing and aircraft operations has been a continuing source of concern for residents in the vicinity of Camp Shelby. Both the Draft and Final EIS examined this issue in some detail. None of the proposed alternatives will increase the levels of this type of noise for any resident, and, to the contrary, the completion of a large tank gunnery training program in 1991 has decreased average noise levels from weapons firing. Recent changes in jet aircraft flight paths, taken in response to issues raised during the EIS process, have decreased the number of overflights in the Paret Tower vicinity. Please see Sections 2.3.2, 3.1.5, 3.2.4, 3.3.5, and 3.4.11.1 of the Final EIS.

21:5 The long term effect on forestry of implementing any of the proposed alternatives is contingent upon its effect on the managed timber base. The proportional effects of implementing any of the alternatives are minor when compared to the total managed timber base of the De Soto National Forest or the regional timber marketing area. Please see additional coverage in Sections 3.3.2.3, 3.3.2.3.1, 3.3.4.3 and 3.5.4.

Responses to comments 21:6, 21:7, 21:8, and 21:9 are on the following page

21:6 In response to high levels of concern, considerable additional emphasis has been placed on Quality of Life in the Final EIS. While some small changes in vehicle noise and fugitive dust are acknowledged to be unavoidable consequences of implementing the new proposed training areas, noise from weapons firing has been decreased as compared to the 1985 to 1990 period. See Sections 3.1.3, 3.2.4, 3.3.3, 3.4.11, and 3.5.8 of the Final EIS.

21:7 The original M1 Main Battle Tank has gone through a normal cycle of improvement and upgrade. It is correct that the basic M1 tank is not in production, but this is because the newer versions such as the M1A1 and M1A2 have taken its place. National Guard units are equipped with M1 and M1A1 models at this time, as well as the older M60A3.

21:8 With one exception, the area being studied for continued military use and additional tank training area does not contain any developed recreation facilities such as hiking trails, picnic areas, campgrounds, overlooks, boat launches, etc.

An ATV trail has been developed within the permit area east of Highway 29 and north of FS 303. This was a cooperative effort with local ATV clubs from Hattiesburg and Wiggins. It will require limiting use to periods when tanks are not training. Thus the potential for possible conflicts exists.

The focal points for recreation on the Black Creek Ranger District are the Black Creek Scenic River and associated corridor, Black Creek Trail, and the Black Creek Wilderness. These account for virtually all non-hunting associated recreational visits. They are known and promoted nationally in outdoor publications and in Forest Service brochures. The amount of visitors to the areas is expected to increase. The re-issuance of the special use permit with or without additional tank training shouldn't affect the use of any of these recreational attractions and associated developed facilities.

The Black Creek Wilderness is no closer than three miles from the permit area boundary at any one point. The Black Creek Scenic River is no closer than two miles at any one point. All developed recreational facilities occur along Black Creek except the small picnic area and handicapped fishing access at the five acre Ashe Lake four miles south of the permit area.

21:9 See response to comment 2:6.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Perry County Board of Supervisors (John Anderson)

22:1 Comment noted.

22:1

IT IS, THEREFORE, HEREBY RESOLVED AND ORDERED by the
Board of Supervisors of Perry County, Mississippi, as

follows:

WE, the Supervisors of Perry County, Mississippi, on
behalf of the National Guard, express our full support for
the United States Forestry Service to grant the use permit
to allow training to be conducted as outlined in Alternative
One of the Environmental Impact Statement relating to this
proposal.

SO RESOLVED AND ORDERED on this, the 25th day of
February, 1992.

PERRY COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI

BY 
JOHN ANDERSON, PRESIDENT
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

ATTEST:


DAN READY,
CHANCERY CLERK

CAME ON FOR CONSIDERATION before the Perry County, Mississippi, Board of Supervisors the matter of expressing support, on behalf of the National Guard, for the United States Forestry Service to grant the Use Permit to allow training as outlined in Alternative 1 in the Environmental Impact Statement conducted regarding this matter. After discussion of the matter, the following Resolution was offered by Supervisor Jessie Clark and seconded by Supervisor John Anderson, and adopted by the Board of Supervisors, to-wit:

RESOLUTION EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE
NATIONAL GUARD IN ITS ATTEMPT TO ACQUIRE
THE CHANGE IN USE PERMIT AS OUTLINED IN
ALTERNATIVE ONE

WHEREAS, the Perry County Board of Supervisors has acknowledged a need for the growth and economic development of Perry County, Mississippi; and

WHEREAS, the Board conducted a full hearing of the matter to determine if its support for the National Guard in its attempt to obtain a change in use permit to allow training was merited; and,

WHEREAS, the testimony before the Board as offered by representatives of the National Guard, United States Forestry Service and private industry all showed that the benefit to the people of Perry County, Mississippi far outweighed any detriment; and,

WHEREAS, Perry County, as shown by the United States Forestry Service, will not lose any funds currently received for the harvest of timber in this county, or in any county in the forest district; and

WHEREAS, the additional training grounds will allow Camp Shelby to remain at its current operational level, and to further have the possibility of expansion, thereby creating further economic opportunity for the citizens of Perry County, Mississippi; and,

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Paul Anderson

23:1 Comment noted. See response to comment 16:3. Refer also to misconception 12 and 14.

23:2 See response to comment 2:31. Refer also to misconception 16.

23:3 Comment noted.

FEB, 13, 1992

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

I AM DEFINITELY AGAINST THE LAND SWAP. THE DESOTO NATIONAL FOREST HAS BEEN A RECREATION SPOT FOR MY FAMILY FOR YEARS.

I HUNT IN LEAF RIVER MANAGEMENT AREA AND IT WILL BE GONE FOREVER.

WHY CLOSE OTHER MILITARY BASES THAT ARE LARGE ENOUGH AND DESERVE ENOUGH FOR TANK TANKABLE AND TAKE AWAY LAND THAT THE PEOPLE OF MISSISSIPPI HAVE MORE THAN PAID FOR.

Paul J. Anderson
40 WOODY CLARK RD.
PETAL, MS, 39465
1-601-545-7919

I BELIEVE ASIDE ALL IS SAID AND DONE, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL TAKE WHAT IT WANTS.

23:1

23:2

23:3

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Virginia Austin

24:1 The opposition to the proposed action is acknowledged. All of the public comments have been given special consideration and many have been incorporated into the final EIS.

143 Seal Cove
Bilohi MA 39530
January 21, 1992

24 JAN REC'D

Dear Mr. Craven,

What can I say? The enclosed letter from the Sun Herald expresses my sentiments even better than I can myself.

Please give our protests your studied, thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,
Virginia B. Austin

Sun Herald letter to the editor not
Reproduced in this FEIS.

24:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Greg Bachhuber

133 LaBranche Avenue
Ocean Springs, MS 39564

7 March 1992

Mobile District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers CESAM-PD-EI
Attn: Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am a resident of Mississippi, and I am writing this letter to express my opposition to the planned Camp Shelby expansion into the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area.

There are many reasons for my feelings, the most noteworthy being my love of the few remaining natural areas we have in our country. I am also a member of the United States Armed Forces, although regulation precludes me from mentioning my rank, branch of service and current assignment. I was in the military during Desert Storm/Shield, and I fully appreciate the necessity for strong military forces. However, I firmly believe with the strongest of convictions, that the additional training area for the National Guard at Camp Shelby is not necessary for this nation's defense. Post-war examinations of the preparedness of the 155th armored brigade have focused, not on the need for additional training ground, but on increasing leadership skills and improving the overall poor physical fitness of the unit members. I have first had knowledge of the sorry physical condition and medical problems of many soldiers in the 155th. Defoliating a huge portion of the Leaf River area will in no way solve those problems. None of these arguments at all touch on the basic issue of the need for training an armor unit to fight a European land-threat that no longer exists.

I also understand the economic impact that the proposed expansion would have. From the studies I am familiar with, the additional benefits would be negligible. Furthermore, it would tie the area to the military for economic success, risking total collapse in the face of military cutbacks, much like the city of Dallas is experiencing now. I do not believe that expanding the site

25:1 Comment noted. Please also see general misconception statements number 5 and 23.

25:2 See response to comment 2:6

25:3 See response to comment 2:6. There is no planned defoliation of the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area, nor any other National Forest administered lands, in this or any other proposal.

25:4 See response to comment 2:6. There is no proposed expansion in personnel. See misconception 25.

25:5 Refer to misconceptions 25 and 3.

25:1

25:2

25:3

25:4

25:5

25:6

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Greg Bachhuber

would protect the base from any future military base closings.	25:6	25:6	Comment noted.
During highschool, a favorite teacher of mine once remarked, "We don't need the Russians, we have the Army Corps of Engineers." As I have grown older, I tend to agree with the sentiment that the Corps has been responsible for many ecological disasters in this country. Please do not make another one. At least, please support alternative 3b, that would limit the amount of damage you inflict to a pristine wildlife area.	25:7	25:7	Please refer to misconception 7 with regards to both the military and environmental point of view with respect to Alternative 3B. Please also see misconceptions 10 and 11 with regards to the LRWMA.

Sincerely,

Greg Ball MD

Greg Bachhuber, MD

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Dennis Bankston

Dear Sirs,
Please be advised I most emphatically
oppose the Leaf River Land Swap.
There are many species of plant and
animal life that are unique to this
region, which can never be replaced
once lost. Among these are a few
ancient yellow pines, the Indigo snake,
virgin hardwood swamps and gopher
tortoise's. What price are we willing
to pay to have memories instead of
experience's? My answer is "not quite
this much." Much thanks for giving
me a chance to voice my opinion.

Yours in South Mississippi,
Dennis M. Bankston

26:1

26:1 Comment noted. Please also see general misconception statement number 12.

26:2

26:2 Comment noted. Species of plants and animals which have been determined to be threatened or endangered at the federal level are afforded protection under the Endangered Species Act. Those species occurring in Mississippi are also listed at the state level, allowing additional protection under state law. U.S. Forest Service policy provides for the protection and enhancement of T&E populations on National Forest lands which include most of the Camp Shelby. The Forest Service also recognizes and manages sensitive species not listed as threatened or endangered (see Section 2.4.5.1.5). National Guard Bureau policy is to comply with all applicable Federal, state, and local regulations. Please also see Sections 2.4.5 and 3.1.2.5 in the FEIS for additional discussion.

26:3

26:3 Comment noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Dennis Bankston

26:4 Comment noted. A Special Use permit is just that. It permits an individual or organization to use, subject to certain conditions and restrictions, Forest Service administered land for a particular purpose. Some examples are powerline/pipeline/road right-of-ways, driveways, Scout camps, ski slopes, military training, bee apiaries, water lines/springs, airports, etc. The permits are usually from one to five years and subject to annual fees. Government entities normally have fees waived. The land remains under the administration of the Forest Service and depending upon the permit, access is unrestricted.

This EIS is analyzing the environmental effects of re-issuing a Special Use permit to the Mississippi Military Department. Public access is restricted west of highway 29 and in the vicinity of the East Air/ground Range east of highway 29 during firing exercises. There are no other access restrictions and the area remains under Forest Service administration, not military control.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PREPARE

Name: DENNIS BANKSTON		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS	
Address: 21786 SAUCIER FAIRLY RD.		Public Comment Meetings	
City: SAUCIER, M.S.	State: MS	City: Gulfport, MS	January 8, 1992
Zip: 39574			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
THE TRACT OF LAND IN QUESTION SHOULD REMAIN IN FULL CONTROL OF THE PUBLIC USERS, NOT MILITARY CONTROL, IT IS A PUBLIC POSSESSION AND SHOULD REMAIN SO AT A 100% LEVEL. IT IS MORE PRODUCTIVE THE WAY IT IS NOW.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Dennis Bankston

26:5 Comment noted.

26:6 See response to comment 42:3. See general misconception statements 9 and 11.

26:7 Comment noted.

26:8 See response to comments 26:4 and 102:5

26:9 See general misconception statement 9.

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of :

5	Dennis Bankston	
6	21786 Saucier Fairley Road	
6	Saucier, Mississippi 39574	
7	I've been in Camp Shelby before, and I've been through	26:5
8	some of the zones that pictures portray as being	
9	rehabilitated, and I've never seen anything that is like	
10	they've got posted out there, for number one. Number two,	26:6
11	it's going to destroy something that's taken hundreds of	
12	years to generate, and we'll never have it back again.	
13	Number three, I don't think the military has the credibility	26:7
14	that they believe they do.	
15	I don't think we'll have the access to the land, to the	
16	area, to the resources that they say we will. And once it's	
17	taken out of our hands and put into someone else's, we all	26:8
18	know full and well that they can do whatever they want with	
19	it from that day forward, and there's not a lot of say we	
20	have to it. And it's something we're going to lose and be	
21	lost forever. And in retrospect we'll see then we made a	
22	terrible mistake, and it will be too late to fix it, and	26:9
23	it's something we'll never get back again. That's it.	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Kathy Bankston

Kathy Bankston
130 Sycamore Lane
Jackson, MS 39212

February 19, 1992

Mobile District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers CESAM-PD-EI
Attn: Thomas M Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

RE: Desoto National Forest

Dear Mr. Craven:

I would like to voice my opposition to alternative #1. Alternative #1 would allow the Guard to seriously harm prime natural areas while abandoning lands already used for that purpose. The difference in alternative #1 and alternative #3 is 2,220 acres. Alternative #1 will result in erosion and run-off in the Black Creek, Mississippi's only congressionally designated Wild & Scenic stream. I am an outdoor lover and have canceled on the Black Creek and it is truly a beautiful creek. It would be a horrible thought to think that this beautiful creek would be harmed by such a decision.

Alternative #3B would allow the National Guard adequate training space but will keep tanks out of the LWRMA. Let's keep the Black Creek a beautiful, scenic stream.

Sincerely,

Kathy Bankston
Kathy Bankston

cc Colonel Pete Denton
Citizens Against the Land Steal
P.O. Box 219
Brooklyn, MS 39425

27:1 Comment noted.

27:2 Comment noted. Please also see the discussion for misconception 7 in Section I, Volume III.

27:3 Comment Noted. Please see Misconception 15. Those areas within the LWRMA that will be used for training are, for the most part, located on the eastern edge of the Black Creek watershed. Clearing and thinning will progress over a four year period and will be supervised by USFS. Appropriate mitigation measures as outlined in Section 3.4.2 will protect Black Creek and its tributaries from siltation and sediment deposition.

27:4 See general misconception statement 7.

27:5 Comment noted. Please see response to Comment 27:3.

27:1

27:2

27:3

27:4

27:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Jack Bartlett

February 19, 1992
601 Cruise
Starkville, Ms. 39759

Mr. Thomas M Craven
U.S. Army Corps Of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am writing this letter in strong opposition to the proposed land steal of the Desota National Forest. I beg you to not allow this proposal to pass and destroy a fragile ecosystem, a valuable, irreplaceable resource, with tank training. It is absolutely insane to suggest loosing such a resource for such unnecessary purposes. THAT LAND BELONGS TO THE PEOPLE OF MISSISSIPPI. You must have a mandate from THEM to carry out your plans. Do you have it? Please stop this nonsense.

Sincerely,

Jack L. Bartlett

P.S. I will do all I can to oppose this proposed action, and I will try to persuade everyone I can to oppose those politicians who support it.

- 28:1 Comment noted. Please also see general misconception statement number 12.
- 28:2 Please refer to misconceptions 9, 10, and 14 with regards to destroying a fragile ecosystem.
- 28:3 The land is held in title by the US government and administered by the US Forest Service under the 1960 Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act and the 1976 National Forest Management Act. These lands are managed for a variety of uses on a sustained basis to ensure a continued supply of goods and services to the American people in perpetuity.
- This EIS is for issuing a Special Use Permit to allow military use of the land. The use of National Forest System lands for military training activities is within the statutory authority of the Organic Act of June 4, 1897.
- No Mississippi state owned land is involved in this permit application.
- See response to comment 26:4 for further discussion and Section 1.1.1 for additional coverage.
- 28:4 Comment noted.



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
MOBILE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 2288
MOBILE, ALABAMA 36628-0001

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

WELCOME OPEN HOUSE PARTICIPANT:

On behalf of the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome you to today's open house on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement regarding the reissuance of a special use permit for Mississippi National Guard use of DeSoto National Forest land.

As you know, the draft environmental impact statement has been published and we are into the public comment period which extends until March 1, 1992. It's important to point out that this is a draft; your comments and suggestions will make this environmental impact statement complete.

There are representatives from the Mississippi National Guard, the U. S. Forest Service and the Corps of Engineers here to answer your questions, to discuss any particular concerns you have, and to assist you in recording your comments so they will become a part of the final impact statement. If you prefer to give a prepared comment, there is a stenographer to take that statement down for the record.

As the agency selected to perform this environmental impact statement, we regard your opinions as critical to our being able to complete our job as thoroughly and with as much information as possible. Please do not hesitate to ask any of us any question. We all share one common goal here -- we're stewards of the environment; a viable environmental impact statement will assure us all that we have fulfilled that stewardship.

Thomas M. Craven

Thomas M. Craven
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers

*I firmly believe land other than our
Forest lands could be used for tank
training. DeSoto should be kept intact
for future generations. y Mrs Alan R Barton*

29:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mrs. Alan Barton

29:1 Comment noted. See response to comment 2:6 and 2:31. Please also see misconception 16.

11 MAR

Dear Sir

I'm very much against any plans to damage
beyond repair our De Soto National Forest, our forests
were preserved for public use & not army maneuvers, we as
tax paying citizens have the right to enjoy the beauty
of De Soto National Forest as well as other public lands,
there is wide spread damage being done all over the
world & now its coming to our beloved state, please leave
our forests as they are our heritage, thank Marion
Beard

At 1 Box 54

Pope Ms 38658

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Marion Beard

30:1 Comment noted. However, please refer to misconception #9 and #14 with regards to the De Soto National Forest being damaged beyond repair.

30:2 The De Soto National Forest was created under the Weeks law and is administered under the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act and the National Forest Management Act (NFMA). The Organic Act of 1897 which created the National Forest System is also still applicable.

The National Forests are managed to produce a wide array of goods and services. Forest plans under NFMA must include coordination of outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, wildlife and fish habitat, and wilderness. The Forest Service manages wildlife and fish habitat while the state agencies manage the populations through hunting regulations. In many cases agreements establishing cooperative wildlife management areas are made between the Forest Service and the appropriate state agency. This type agreement established the Leaf River Game Refuge in 1930 and the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area in 1954. It provides housing for a manager and funding agreements for performing habitat and population work with different degrees of participation by both agencies. Other normal National Forest activities are carried out on the lands designated as the Management Area. Some of these are timber sales, endangered species work, watershed restoration and protection, recreation activities, oil-gas exploration, etc.

The use of National Forest System lands for military training activities is within the statutory authority of the Organic Act of 1897. The 1988 Master Agreement (Appendix A) between the Secretaries of Agriculture and Defense authorizes training activities on National Forest System lands when it is compatible with other uses and in conformity with applicable forest plans, provided the Department of Defense determines and substantiates that lands under its administration are unsuitable or unavailable.

See also responses to comments 2:4 and 14:27 and misconception 22.

30:3 Comment noted.

30:4 Comment noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Gail Bishop

P. O. Box 1522
Ocean Springs, MS
39564

February 25, 1992

Mr. Tom Craven
Department of the Army
Mobile District Corps of Engineers
Inland Environmental Section
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am not in favor of the National Guard Plan to expand tank training deeper into the Desoto National Forest including the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area. I do not have facts and figures to impress Army Corps of Engineers against this proposal, but I believe that using a National Forest for tank exercises or for any military practice is unsound judgement. 31:1

The cumulative affects of using mixed hardwood/pine forests for tank training is numerable: loss of habitat for wildlife, erosion, loss of recreational areas, and loss of clean air and water. Perhaps more importantly, is possible message that we could give our young people: tanks and guns are more important than wild areas and animals. 31:2 31:3

We are kin to nature...not adversaries! We must treat our National Forests with respect. 31:4

Sincerely yours,

Gail Bishop
Gail Bishop
Lauren Clark's mother

31:1 Comment noted.

31:2 Comment noted. Preparers note that proposed maneuver area development is restricted to upland areas, and the lowland hardwood forests are largely in environmental setaside areas. The cumulative effects are discussed in Section 3.5 of the Final EIS. Please also see the response to comments 21:3 and 21:8.

31:3 Comment noted.

31:4 Comment noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mr. and Mrs. Tony Bond

Dear Mr. Thomas M. Cioara,
Recently at a meeting about the
Camp Shelby Land Proposal, I was given
your name and address to send my
comments.

I live in Perry County in the
Proposed zone. Now, I have several
questions and I'll start with this.

Why has the land with settled families
adjoining been chosen? Why not desert
land or land outside the National Forest?

We have three little girls ages 3, 4
and 8 years old. Also, we have a niece
that is 5 and a 2 year old nephew next
door to us. I'm an overprotective mother

but I don't know anyone who would
want their children in the middle of a
sanctuary of food marshes, prairies,

National open spaces. Our driveway goes
thru a small portion of this land. I
land that we live on has been in the

Bond family for years. The roads even
have our names. We've always wanted
to raise our children in the country,
away from drugs and crime.

32:1 See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31. See misconception 16.

32:2 Comment noted. This invalid perception of the National Guard is even less true today than it was decades ago. With the increased emphasis on training and physical fitness, the Guardsman of today has even less time for leisure activities when undergoing training at Camp Shelby or any other installation. The Guardsman -- and woman -- of today represents a cross section of the citizens of this state and must mirror this social image.

by the National Guard get this thru, then it will seem like we're in the middle of a war zone. How safe do you think children ages 2, 3, 4, 5 and 8 will feel with guns, tanks and helicopters sounding out all night and day? Not to mention the fact that the school bus goes through the same Reserve every day twice a day transporting children.

Another question is why do they need more land when they've done fine with what they have. Our National Forest means alot to us, and we never abuse it. But, once they cut the timber, and tanks start coming in, the beauty will be gone, and the forest destroyed. There are people in this country who have never been to the forest and seen deer or turkey. And never heard and felt the peacefulness that you get just listening to nature. Please don't take this away from us and our families to come.

Thank you,
T.V. + Mrs. Tony Bond

32:3 Comment noted. Additional coverage has been given in the Final EIS to these Quality of Life concerns (Sections 3.1.3 and 3.3.3). Proposed Training Area 1 has also been reconfigured to provide buffering from residences in closest proximity. See response to comments 2:81, 2:339, 3:37 and Sections 1.2.1.4.8, 3.3.5.3, 3.4.11, 3.5.8 and 3.5.11.

32:4 See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:32.

32:5 Comment noted. See misconceptions 9 and 17.

32:3

32:4

32:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Edna Boone et al.

MS Gulf Coast Comm. College
Jefferson Davis Campus
Feb. 12, 1992

Mr. Tom Craven
Mobile District Corp. of Engineers
Inland Environment Section
P. O. Box 27288
Mobile, Ala 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven,

The former land swap of Desoto National Forest land for Colorado grassland has evolved into a land grab of Forest Service land. In Alternative 1, the National Guard's preference (from the Environmental Impact Statement), 39,772 acres would be set aside for tank training. The Guard would abandon 11,500 acres on which it now trains for this new acreage. Of the new forest, 14,105 acres would be clear cut; 7112 acres would be severely thinned, harvesting 77 million board feet of lumber.

As personnel of the Jefferson Davis Campus of the Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College we are writing to oppose this transfer.

Currently a federal moratorium bans land acquisition by all branches of the military. The Desoto Forest land grab is described as a "reconfiguration of a special use permit."

The Guard plans to train in 63 ton M 1 tanks. These are no longer in production. Further, after 3 years no new parts will be available for repair of existing M 1's.

Currently the military's total force concept relies on armored guard round out brigades as one part of a triad with the reserves and the standing army. Recently the General Accounting Office released its investigation (GAO/NSIAD-91-263) of the 155th Armored Brigade that trains at Camp Shelby. For reasons that had nothing to do with lack of training space or equipment, the 155th when activated was not up to readiness. The following are findings from this investigation: 1) 33% of the guardsmen couldn't pass a medical or dental screen. 2) Personnel were inadequately trained in ordering parts using the army system. 3) They record a "severe weakness in leadership skills" including a "so what attitude". 4) They "displayed tactical and technical weaknesses" and "serious discipline problems". 5) At Ft. Hood these times as much time was required to bring guardsmen to readiness as for standing army personnel.

As a consequence of these problems the military is reassessing the role of round out brigades. They now have an uncertain mission. Future budget cuts, estimated to equal 30% over the next 5 years, are likely to eliminate active elite armored guard round out units or convert them to support roles. Congressman Sonny Montgomery predicts that 1/3 of National Guard armories will close. Do we want to sacrifice our forest to find that the stripped land stands idle?

The Environmental Impact Statement describes other alternative plans. Alternative 3b, supported by the Sierra Club, designates that area north of Forest Service Road 303 and west of Hwy. 29 for tank maneuvers. This totals 18,997 acres and includes that already intensively used by the military. Alternative 4, supported by the Audubon Society, maintains the status quo, allowing no expansion of training area. Alternative 5 prohibits tank maneuvers.

We support any alternative that preserves the pine and hardwood forests for future generations. We strongly oppose giving away resources for no public benefit.

In summary, the National Guard plan to take land when land acquisition is banned, to train forces with an uncertain mission, using equipment that is now being phased out represents folly in the extreme.

xc: Congressman Gene Taylor
Colonel Pete Denton
Mr. Ken Johnson, Supervisor, U. S. Forest Service

Sincerely,

33:1

33:3 See response to comment 21:7.

33:4 See response to comment 2:6.

33:5 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6.

33:6 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 7.

33:7 Comment noted.

33:8 See responses to comments 2:6, 16:10, and 21:7.

33:2

33:3

33:4

33:5

33:6

33:7

33:8

Edna Boone
 Fred Bonnell
 Elaine Sells
 C R Shand
 Mary T. Sanderson
 W E Threlkeld
 Larry M. Allen
 David Stutz
 Charles Davis
 Nancy Lund
 T Smith
 Dennis I. Wickel
 Henry M. Ferguson Jr.
 Fort H. Wheeler
 Tracy Lindley
 J. F. Lee
 Barbara Martin
 Pam Skene
 Kathy N. Call
 Gene S. Shuck
 Joseph W. Carter Jr.
 Gwen Sugard
 Mary Stutz

Elizabeth Waldorf
 Lina Sessum
 R. L. Stappard
 William G. Mathen
 Vicki Berry
 Patricia L. Hursey
 Jack C. Koch
 Wayne C. Root
 Michael
 Diane Holman
 S. W. Weber
 Betty Sandberg
 Mary Bailey
 Pete Griffith
 Deane Nunn
 Janice S. Walters
 Deanne
 Jerry Morgan
 Elaine Starnitz
 Bob Cuff
 Edward Malone
 Barbara Ferrell
 Susan Lagano
 Ellen Jones
 Sandy Miller

John R. Bradley, Jr.
107 Phillip Road
Oxford, MS 38655

To: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers CESAM-PD-II

ATTN: T. M. CAVERN

DESOTO NATIONAL FOREST SHOULD BE
PROTECTED.

The National Guard's alternative #1
would devastate significant values of Desoto.

While I think the expansion of Camp
Shelby into DESOTO is BOTH UNNECESSARY
AND UNWISE, the alternative #3B
is, in my opinion, the only expansion
plan set out which is within the
bounds of reasonable protection
of our irreplaceable natural
heritage — the natural environment.

Sincerely,

John R. Bradley Jr.

March 8, 1992

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
John Bradley, Jr.

34:1 Comment noted.

34:2 Comment noted. Please also see general misconception statements 5 and 7.

34:1

34:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Margarite Breland et al.

February 24, 1992

Army Corps of Engineers CESAM-PD-EI
Mobile District
P. O. Box 2288
Attention: PD-EI Tom Craven
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

RE: Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Military Training Use of National Forest Lands
Camp Shelby, MS

Gentlemen:

We have reviewed the above Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and we have attended several public meetings regarding this matter.

We have a strong interest in the matter as we have property in Sections 31 T-1N, R9W and 36 T-1N, R10W which adjoins Proposed Corridor 3, 6, near Training Area 2; copies of ownership maps are attached.

We do not believe that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement considered all appropriate matters. We do not believe the Draft Environmental Impact Statement addressed the long term effects of the proposed alternatives. We do not believe that the long term effects on the people, endangered species and wildlife living in the area has been given adequate consideration. We do not believe that the long term effect on the timber industry and the local economy has been adequately considered. Instead, we believe that a short-sighted approach has been taken in the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement because of pressure from the National Guard, politicians, and a few individuals that are looking out for their own selfish interest. We do not believe that the long term effect on wildlife management and recreational use of the DeSoto National Forest has been considered. We do not believe that adequate consideration has been given to erosion, soil and water pollution, loss of wetlands, loss of watershed, and adverse effects to Black Creek, Leaf River, Hickory Creek, Whiskey Creek, Cypress Creek, smaller streams, and the Pascagoula River system. We do not believe that adequate consideration has been given to the effect upon the loss of 21,000 acres which will be cut and the additional 15,000 acres of previous unused maneuver area of the DeSoto National Forest. We do not believe

35:1 Comment noted. The Draft EIS may not have considered all appropriate matters in great detail. However, the Final EIS discusses in detail both the short-term and long-term effects of the proposed alternatives. See Section 4.1.3.1.

35:2 See response to comment 35:1.

35:3 See responses to comments 35:1, 21:2, and 21:5. Please also see Sections 3.2.4.3 and 3.4.9 of the Final EIS.

35:4 Comment noted.

35:5 See responses to comments 35:1 and 21:8.

35:6 Comment noted. Extensive additional coverage has been given to the issue of soil loss in the Final EIS. Following implementation of the mitigation procedures described in sections 3.4.2 through 3.4.6, there should be no decrease in the water quality of Black Creek or the other major streams in the watershed.

35:7 See additional coverage in Sections 3.3.2.3 and 3.3.4.3.

35:8 Please see additional coverage in Section 3.5.4 and the response to comment 35:7.

35:1

35:2

35:3

35:4

35:5

35:6

35:7

35:8

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Margairite Breland et al.

PAGE 2

that adequate consideration has been given to the loss of so much forest land upon the ability of the U.S. Forest Service to maintain and supervise the remaining part of the Black Creek Division of the Desoto National Forest. We do not believe that consideration has been given to the loss of forest service personnel if alternative 1 or 2 is selected. We do not believe that adequate consideration has been given to the loss of a major portion of a pristine sixty year old long leaf pine forest if alternative 1 or 2 is selected. We do not believe that adequate consideration has been given to changes that have occurred throughout the world that have reduced the need for such military training facility. We do not believe that adequate consideration has been given to military spending cutbacks. We do not believe that adequate consideration has been given as to whether the tanks, the proposed maneuvers, and the combat role of the National Guard might become obsolete.

We do not believe that the National Guard is justified in trying to increase the size of their training facility at the present time, and there does not appear to be a significant future danger to justify future expansion. We do not believe that there is a justifiable reason to cut 21,000 acres of prime long leaf forest. We do not believe that adequate consideration has been given to other land that Camp Shelby is already using. We do not believe that adequate consideration has been given to the use of other existing tank training facilities.

Taking into consideration all of the Alternatives proposed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, we believe that alternatives 1 and 2 should be rejected. We believe that alternatives 3B, 3A, or 4 should be selected. We believe that tanks and track vehicles should be limited to the area North of Forest Service Road 303 and also the area West of Highway 29. We believe that alternatives 3B, 3A or 4 will have less adverse effects on the private land owners, the local Janice community, wildlife, Black Creek, and Leaf River Wildlife Management Area than alternatives 1 or 2.

We are not opposed to having a strong national defense. We do not want to see anyone lose their job at Camp Shelby. We do not want to see Camp Shelby closed.

However, there does not appear to be an overriding national or military need for alternatives 1 or 2. If we were faced with a military threat, there might be some argument that could be made. However, such is not the case. There does not appear to be any significant military threat. Also alternatives 1 and 2 appear to be contrary to the national interest. Our biggest threat is not a military threat but an economic threat. The United States has mortgaged the lives of the next generation. We have a tremendous national debt. We have to stop spending money and expanding programs that are not necessary for the national interest. Camp Shelby should

- 35:9 No changes in employment are predicted. See also response to comment 35:7.
- 35:10 See response to comment 1:10. See misconception 11.
- 35:11 See response to comment 2:6. See misconception 8.
- 35:12 Military budgets have been significantly reduced in the past several years, and they will probably continue to be reduced. The Secretary of Defense stated, however, in December, 1993, that the National Guard will play an increased role in training heavy combat arms units (see Section 1.1.2.3 of the Final EIS). Please also see misconception 8.
- 35:13 See response to comment 2:6.
- 35:14 See response to comment 2:6. Please also see misconception 5.
- 35:15 Comment noted.
- 35:16 Comment noted. The issue raised is discussed in section 1.1.2.1 of the Final EIS, where it is noted that it is not possible to hold maneuver training concurrently with tank gunnery training in the existing configuration. Preparers also note that Camp Shelby is using all the areas proposed for new maneuver areas, and has done so for decades. It is only *off-road, tracked vehicle* training which would be new to the areas.
- 35:17 See response to comment 2:31.
- 35:18 Comment noted. Please also see general misconception statement number 7.
- 35:19 Comment noted.
- 35:20 Your comment is noted. See misconception 7.
- 35:21 Comment noted.
- 35:22 Comment noted. Also see response to comment 2:6.
- 35:23 Comment noted. See response to comment 2:6.

make do with what they have been using. According to all news reports, the defense budget and the role of the National Guard will be reduced significantly. The National Guard should not be allowed to expand its training facilities and spend taxpayers money unless it is in the national interest.

We should not allow an additional 37,000 acres of forest land to be turned over to the National Guard.

We should not allow 21,000 acres of a pristine long leaf forest in the DeSoto National Forest to be cut. We have been advised that a majority of the 21,000 acres is approximately 60 year growth. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement is silent as to the effect of the loss of such timber for 60+ years. This land will not be put back into production like other forest service land. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement is silent also as to the global effect of the loss of 21,000 acres of long leaf pine forest with a majority of 60 year growth considering "the green house effect", the loss of the protective ozone layer, acid rain, and other world wide environmental dangers.

If alternatives 1 or 2 are selected and 21,000 acres of forest was cut from the DeSoto National Forest, it would be tragic to the local land owners and the Janice community, and it would be a national disgrace.

Hubert Calvin Breland died in 1991. He voiced his strong opposition at several public meetings. He served in the armed forces during World War II. He loved the land, and his memory lives on in opposition to the attempt by the National Guard to take the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area and to cut 21,000 acres of a pristine 60 year old long leaf pine forest.

Margarite Breland is the widow of Hubert Calvin Breland. Margaret Reid is the daughter of Hubert Calvin Breland and Margarite Breland. Charles Reid is the husband of Margaret Reid.

Respectfully submitted,


Margarite Breland


Margaret Reid


Charles Reid

2 Ownership Maps Included with this Letter Have Not Been Reproduced in this FEIS.

35:24 See response to comment 2:6.

35:25 Please see general misconception statements 5 and 12.

35:26 See general misconception statement 11. See response to comment 1:10.

35:27 Preparers cannot identify any significant consequences relevant to global warming which are related to the proposed action. The harvest process would offset proposed harvests in other nearby areas in the De Soto National Forest. The vegetation planted to maintain land cover will photosynthesize, and utilize atmospheric carbon dioxide, roughly as effectively as the forest species. No major change is foreseen.

35:28 Comment noted.

35:28

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Margarite Breland et al.

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

COMMENTS BY MARGARITE BRELAND

400 South 32nd Avenue

Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39401

BY MS. BRELAND:

I'm Margarite Breland, Hubert
Breland's wife. And he has since deceased the
last meeting, and he asked me, as long as there
was breath in my body, to fight, to not let them
come down around our fence, that that tank trail
is planning on going on right around our fence.
And we do not want them down there. We want them
to stay up in the Beaumont area. They've always
roamed all over everything down there, plains and
everything else. But we don't want those tanks
down in there. I just don't think it's right.

If they would come and sit on that
porch one afternoon and feel how near they are to
God, they would never ever want to destroy it.
That house has been there, I guess, some 70 years,
and I want it to stay as is. This is a request of
my husband before he passed away. I lost him to
cancer in June of '91. And I'm gonna be there
fighting just as long as it goes on. And that's
my main comment. Just leave it alone, and we'll
all be happy.

35:29 Comment noted.

35:30 Comment noted.

35:29

35:30

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Margarite Breland et al.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY MARGARITE BRELAND

400 South 32nd Avenue

Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39401

BY MS. BRELAND:

I have talked to them about the
blacktop in front of the house, and I would like
for that added into my comments also. I would
like for that area to be blacktopped. I'm tired
of eating dust from all the vehicles. Okay?
Thank you so much. I'll know for sure it gets in
there now, won't I?

35:31

35:31 Comment noted. Dust abatement on tank trails through use of water trucks is a
part of the current mitigation program (see Section 3.2.4 of the Final EIS). Please also
see response to comment 51:6.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Sheri Brewer

Rt. 2, Box 178A
Raleigh, MS 39153
January 10, 1992

Mr. Trent Lott
U. S. Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Re: Camp Shelby

Dear Mr. Lott:

Please know that we are supporting you in your efforts to maintain the operations at Camp Shelby. 36:1

Camp Shelby offers many advantages to the State of Mississippi and I believe that we should continue to support these facilities. 36:2

Sincerely,

Sheri Brewer

Sheri Brewer

36:1 Comment noted.

36:2 Comment noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Richard Broome

2/14/92

Mobile District U.S.
Army Corps of Engineers CESAM-PD-EI
Attn: Thomas M. Craven
PO Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven,

I would like to express
my opposition to the expansion
of vehicle training into the Leaf
River WMA. I am completely
opposed to Alt. #1 in the E15 land
and support Alt. #3B with reservation.
Actually I support the increased
Area.

Please support what the
people of Mississippi want - a
recreation area - not a tank
training ground.

Sincerely,
Richard L. Broome

RICHARD L. BROOME
1231 CANTERBURY LANE
CLINTON, MS 38053

37:1 Comment noted.

37:2 Comment noted. Also see general misconception statement 7.

37:3 Comment noted.

37:4 Comment noted. The area being studied for continued military use including tracked vehicle training is part of the De Soto National Forest and does not contain any designated recreation areas. The National Forest is administered to provide a wide array of goods and services, recreation is just one of several.

See response to comment 30:2 for additional information.

37:1

37:2

37:3

37:4

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Lin Brown

Feb. 18, 1992
Rt. 1 - Box 121
Benton, MS. 39039

Thomas H. Craven
US Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Ala. 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven,

I oppose the expanded tank training in the De Soto National Forest. This country has no established mission or need - an expansion would diminish the quality of life for the people who live near, the fragile ecosystem within the park and to all citizens of this country who have a vested interest in this and all National Parks.

Please, stop this act of aggression -

Sincerely
E. Lin Brown

38:1 Comment noted.

38:2 See response to comment 2:6.

38:3 Comment noted. Additional coverage has been added in the Final EIS to many Quality of Life Issues (Sections 3.1.3, 3.2.4, 3.3.3, and 3.4.11) The area is described as a "fragile ecosystem" by the commentator when in fact, this area and region in general have proved to have rather resilient ecosystems. An examination of the history of south Mississippi shows that the area has undergone drastic ecological modification and management by humans starting with indigenous peoples (Refer to Sections 2.4.3, 2.4.6, and 2.5.3 in the Final EIS.) Please see the discussions for misconceptions 5, 9, 10, and 11 in section 1, Volume III of the Final EIS. Preparers note that no national park areas are involved.

38:4 Comment noted.

38:1

38:2

38:3

38:4

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Ed Burns

39:1 Comment noted.

39:2 Comment noted.

39:3 Comment noted. See response to comment 2:6.

39:1

39:2

39:3

Mobile District,
Corps of Engineers
AESAH-PO-ET
PO Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001
29 Feb 92

Re: Bureau of Reclamation 36,349'
Acres of Riparian R.F. to MVA,
Camp Hill

Greetings:

I do not want to see our military
"cowboys" increase their playground "at
the expense of our timberland."

Cowboyism is a good thing! It gets
people fired up and motivated! But in
this case, the cowboys should rein-in.
We love to expand the playground, but
a wet, depleted, engineer working for
the Navy and loyal American.

But in this case, I think the
threat is low. The cost to our
environment, high.
My shot, spin in and live with
what you've got.

Sincerely

Ed Burns
Gulfport

CF: Tundlett : 730 Hart Bldg. Wash. D.C. 20510
Gene Taylor : 9484 14th. Gulfport 39501
See Herald: PO Box 4567, Biloxi, MS 39535

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Burnah Burris

306 East Main
Clinton, Ms. 39056
March 1, 1992

Thomas M. Craven, Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Sir,

We, the citizens, do not want to lose
the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area. Too
much of our beautiful country has been destroyed,
and the National Guard does not need this land.

40:1

I oppose alternative #1, and support
alternative 3B.

40:2

Burnah Burris
306 East Main
Clinton, Ms. 39056

40:1 Comment noted. Please see misconceptions 10 and 14 with respect to losing the
Leaf River Wildlife Management Area.

40:2 Comment noted. Also see general misconception statement 7.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Rosa Bustin

41:1 Comment noted.

41:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 28:3 and 30:2.

41:3 See response to comment 21:2.

41:4 See response to comment 21:3.

41:5 See response to comment 21:4.

41:6 See response to comment 21:5.

41:7 See response to comment 21:6.

41:8 See response to comment 2:6.

(Response to 41:9 on the following page)

41:10 See response to comment 21:7.

41:11 See response to comment 21:8.

41:12 See response to comment 2:31 and misconception 16.

Rosa Kathleen Bustin
140 W. 19th St.
Laurel, MS. 39440
February 17, 1992

Mr. Thomas M. Crauen
Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Ala. 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Crauen,

As a citizen, taxpayer, and voter I am very much opposed to tank training being expanded in this beautiful, and useful Old South National Forest, "the people's" own that land, and not just Senny, Bone, Shad, Bent and Gammon.

I have been given this list of specific reasons for not giving up our land for complete destruction, I pass them on to you - 1. Loss of timber revenues from Machine, Clear-cutting-2. Damage to fragile ecosystems which involve protected animals and plants. 3. Noise pollution which has not been adequately studied. 4. Loss of forestry and forest related jobs. 5. Diminished quality of life, especially for the people who live near this proposed tank training and the entire state. 6. No established missile and the 7. The recent reduction in the military and halted production on the M-1 tank. 8. The loss of recreational facilities to visitors across the country.

And #9 - you should break up your fallow ground. There is idle land that could be used in these United States and torn up for tank training with out tearing up and destroying property.

41:1

41:2

41:3

41:4

41:5

41:6

41:7

41:8

41:10

41:11

41:12

as important, useful and beneficial to as
many people as the De Soto National Forest is.
I didn't hand a specific reason # 9 if re-
member what the Bible says about breaking up
your fallow ground, you'll find that in Jer. 4:3
and Hosea 10:12 and I know there is enough
idle land that can be used for tank training
with out destroying land already in vital
use to the people. If we have the need
again.

Sincerely,

Rosa Kathryn Bustin

41:12

41:9

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Malcolm Byrd

Malcolm Byrd
109 Stevens St.
Petal, MS 39465

26 February 1992

Mobile District U.S. Army Corp of Engineers CESAN-PD-EI
Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2298
Mobile, AL 36628-001

Dear Thomas M. Craven,

My main objection to the expansion of military training in the Desota National Forest is the simple fact that the use of forest for military maneuvers and the use of forest for the growing of trees are not compatible.

The Forestry Services told me they would like to replant the impact area that the National Guard now uses; that is provided that area is abandoned and the proposed reconfiguration is activated. From what I have been told by hunters who have been in that area, it is doubtful that planting in the impact area would be practical, dangerous because of the possibility of live shells in the earth.

It is my opinion that the Forestry Service has let the National Guard destroy this land. They told me themselves that the reason they didn't look for RCW in the impact area is that there are few if any trees. I have seen pictures of trees blown in half by the Guard.

My complaint so far may be pointless, since the National Guard has been given a special use permit in the past and will probably continue to use part of Desota National Forest, but note, I am saying the National Guard has destroyed forest land and will continue destroying forest land. I say, let them continue to destroy the land (the impact area) they are now using.

Another concern is the Gopher Tortoise (G. ployphemus). The Draft Environment Impact Statement advised the use of buffer zones (Page L-1-8) around Gopher Tortoise's colonies. 200 hundred feet may be inadequate. It should be determined what range in feet or miles G. ployphemus covers within his life time, on a smaller time scale, and especially during mating season. I was told by an official with the Forestry Service that they males may travel up to two miles during mating season. Please, try and obtain this information and

42:1 Comment noted.

42:2 Comment noted. It is acknowledged in the EIS (Section 3.6) that the main artillery impact area is a dedicated use which it is impractical to remediate. It has been used for this purpose as long ago as WW I, prior to the formation of the De Solo National Forest. No expansion of the impact area is a part of any alternative.

42:3 Refer to misconceptions 13 and 17.

42:4 Military use of areas near gopher tortoise colonies is controlled by the provisions of a Biological Opinion prepared by the US Fish and Wildlife service (See Appendix L of the FEIS). Please also see the responses to comments 1:4, 1:33, and 3:27.

42:1

42:2

42:3

42:4

include it in your final draft.

Also, the lost of market potential in dollar, from trees that would be cut before they have reached their full market value, should be included in a final draft. I was told by an official with the forestry service that the lost would be about one million per year. I am referring to trees that would be clear cut or thinned. A scale should be devised to show what these trees would bring on the market if they continued to grow an additional ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, and sixty years.

I could continue with this letter and make it very long. I have many concerns about the impact on the forest industry, wildlife, recreation, etc. Let me reiterate my main concern and what should be obvious to all who are knowledgeable about the wise use of forest. When one cuts a young tree, it is of less value that a tree that is allowed to grow. And of course, when you blow a tree in half, that tree is not of much use either.

Sincerely,

Malcolm Byrd
Malcolm Byrd

42:4

42:5

42:6

24:7

42:8

42:5 Please see additional discussion on tree values within plantations (Section 3.3.2.3 and Appendix O, Part 6). Relative per acre values at different ages may be estimated from the tree values in this section, e.g. a 40 year old tree is worth about 14 times as much as a 20 year old tree. Because the number of trees per acre declines with age, an acre at 40 years of age is valued at about eight times the value of an acre of 20 year old trees. The total value loss in Alternatives 1 and 2 would be about \$1 million across the 40 year period, or about \$25,000 per year. The value loss from Alternatives 3A and 3B would be about one-fourth of this.

42:6 Appendix O contains estimated per acre volumes by age and species for the proposed maneuver areas and corridors, including total volume and value by 10-year period. This appendix also contains an explanation of the method used to derive the values used. Following your suggestion, the increase in tree value over time has been added to Section 3.3.1.3 of the Final EIS.

42:7 Comment noted.

42:8 The effects suggested, while measurable, are expected to be very small over at least the next 40 years. Please see Section 3.5.10.2 of the Final EIS. Also see general misconception statement number 13.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FINELY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings
Name: <u>ANALISA EVAN</u>	Gulfport, MS	
Address: <u>109 STEVENS ST</u>	January 8, 1992	
City: <u>PETAL</u>	State: <u>MS</u> Zip: <u>39465</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
42:9		SHOULD THERE NOT BE A STUDY TO DETERMINE WHY THE RCW ARE NO LONGER NESTING IN THE DESIRED NATIONAL- FOREST (CAMP SHELBY)
42:10	RESOURCE AREA:	SUGGEST THE WHY NOT USE RAPID GROWTH ON LOGGED TRACTS TO DETERMINE TRAIL SPACE OF MANAGEMENT. CANNOT AFFORD LORD NEEDED TO INSURE THEIR SURVIVAL WHY NOT HAVE A BREEDING PROGRAM
42:11	RESOURCE AREA:	WHY SHOULD THE FOREST SERVICE BE WILLING TO LET THE CLEAR- CUT REDUCE NO. OF TREES THAT HAVE NOT OBTAINED THEIR POTENTIAL (HIGHEST OBTAINABLE) MARKET & POTENTIAL
42:12	RESOURCE AREA:	WHY WILL BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE IF A LARGE VOLUME OF TREES ARE CUT IN A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME AND THE MARKET IS FLOODED WITH CHEAP TIMBER AND DEPRESSING THE SHELL HAMP DOWNS TIMBER SALES
42:13	RESOURCE AREA:	WHY IS THE AMOUNT OF TRAINING TIME THE NATIONAL GARD RECEIVES INADEQUATE TO JUSTIFY THEIR CONTINUED TRAINING WITH TREES. IF THAT TIME IS PROSECUTED, WHY ACCORDING TO A GAD STUDY, HAS THE GARD PREPARED TO SERVE IN PRESENT SITUATION

42:9 Please see the response to comment 14:24.

42:10 Using radio telemetry to identify GT home ranges and movement patterns has been discussed and will very likely be utilized in future research projects. Breeding programs for T&E species are not without controversy and are typically initiated as a last resort. According to the 1992 biological opinion and assessments, the GT population on Camp Shelby appears stable and the outlook is positive. If however, the GT population is failing to reproduce naturally an artificial breeding program may then be an viable option.

42:11 When a decision is made to grant a special use permit, of whatever type, the permitted use may preclude timber management considerations concerning timing of harvest. The area of the permit which may need clearing is harvested to meet the permittee's needs. In most cases, which will involve harvesting some stands before they are economically mature.

42:12 This issue is examined in Section 3.3.2.3 and mitigation addressed in Section 3.4.9 and 3.5.10.2 of the Final EIS.

42:13 See response to comment 2:6.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mrs. Charles Carson

Mrs. Charles Clifton Carson
Box 58, Lake Road
Conehatta, Mississippi 39057

February 14, 1992

Dear Mr. Craven,

I am very disturbed and distressed over the proposed seizure of even more of our precious Delta National Forest especially the ruining of the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area (LRWMA).

I would prefer that no more land be slated for clear-cutting for tank training but at least alternative 3B will allow the National Guard adequate space and will keep tanks out of the LRWMA.

The more our national forests are decimated, the greater deleterious effect it has on the ozone layer, which

43:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 12, 14, and 23.

43:2 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 7.

43:3 Comment noted. However, the issue of the ozone layer is believed to be beyond the scope of the EIS. Please also see responses to comments 14:47 and 35:27.

43:1

43:2

43:3

43:4 See sections 3.3.2.4, 3.3.2.5, and 3.3.2.6 in which changes to vegetation and habitat are addressed.

43:5 Comment noted. No wilderness areas are affected by any proposal for tracked vehicle maneuver. See misconceptions 10, 14 and 15.

43:4

2) and to destroy wild life
habitats will upset even more
the balance of nature.

We must preserve wilderness
areas for our grandchildren and
their descendants.

Many, many others feel as I
do. The people of Mississippi
want the LRWMA preserved.

Thank you for your help,
Sincerely,

Corinth W. Carson
(Mrs. Charles C. Carson)

43:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Arlene Cates

924 Arter Ave. # 208
Ocean Springs, MS 39564
February, 26, 1992

Dear Mr. Craven

Please add this letter to the group which opposed using our beautiful Ole Soto National Forest for being destroyed by M-1 tanks.

There is no valid reason for this destruction. Our tanks have done well in the past -- where did they train then? The military reduction and halted production of the M-1 tank tell me this is reason enough to continue to maintain the environment in its present natural state and to continue to allow the wonderful people who live in the area to maintain their tranquil way of life.

Once the forest is destroyed, the plants and animals are gone, too. The recreational facility will be gone as well as forestry related jobs, which, I might add, I know to be a noble profession. This is one time I definitely wrote to maintain the status quo.

Sincerely,
Arlene Cates

44:1

44:2

44:3

44:4

44:5

44:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 9.

44:2 See response to comment 2:6 and general misconception statement 9.

44:3 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 21:6 and 21:7.

44:4 See discussion in Sections 3.3.4.3 and 3.5.4 and response to comments 21:5 and 21:8, and misconceptions 13 and 17.

44:5 Comment noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Jean Chunn

- 45:1 Comment noted. Please also see misconceptions 12 and 23.
45:2 Please see response to comment 35:6 and misconceptions 9 and 15.
45:3 Please refer to misconceptions 8 and 11. See response to comment 2:6.
45:4 Please refer to misconceptions 7, 14, and 15.

5483 River Thames Place
Jackson, MS 39211
February 25, 1992

Mobile District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers CESAM-PD-EI
Attn: Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am writing in opposition to alternative #1 which would turn over many acres of the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area to Camp Shelby for tank maneuvers.

My husband and I are life-long Mississippians who enjoy camping, hiking, and canoeing in our state's national and state public lands. Black Creek is one of our favorite places to canoe camp because it is such a natural wilderness area where we can feel in harmony with nature to relieve some of the stress of our busy lives as an attorney and school librarian.

Not only would clearing the land for tank maneuvers do away with much wildlife habitat, but the erosion into Black Creek would pollute Mississippi's only Wild and Scenic stream.

With the nation's decision to cut back on military size and spending, it would be a tragedy to despoil a natural area which should be protected to hand down to future generations to carry on unnecessary military maneuvers.

Alternative 3B would be an acceptable compromise to give the National Guard enough land without ruining the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area and Black Creek.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jean Chunn

Mrs. Anson Bob Chunn

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Wayne Claude

46:1 Comment noted.

46:2 See response to comment 2:6. See general misconception statement 12.

Dear Sir:

I am opposed to the DeSoto Forest land swap.
The army has not shown a pressing need for this
land except for using the Tatum salt dome for
nuclear waste storage. The damage to the land
outweighs the benefits.

Sincerely,

JE

Wayne Claude
Registered voter

46:1

46:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Burke Cochran

FOR MORE INFORMATION, TO SUBMIT COMMENTS, OR TO OBTAIN

A COPY OF THE DRAFT EIS, CONTACT MOBILE DISTRICT,

U. S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, ATTN: CESAM-PD-EI

(MR. THOMAS M. CRAVEN), P. O. BOX 2289, MOBILE, AL

36628-0001, OR CALL (205) 698-2872.

47:1 Comment noted.

47:2 See response to comment 2:6. See general misconception statements 5 and 8.

47:3 Section 2.4.3 describes the De Soto National Forest and Camp Shelby area as it appeared in the 1930's. It is true that sixty years of timber management will be foregone on the acreage cleared. The remaining area, however, will continue to receive timber management practices. Should the need of cleared areas for tank maneuvering diminish, then the areas would be returned to normal National Forest management. Within thirty five years well stocked stands of longleaf pine sawtimber would occupy these previously cleared areas.

47:1

47:2

47:3

Mr. Thomas M. Craven:

Corps of Engineers

Mobile, Alabama

Dear Sir:

In regard to the proposed enlargement of the Camp Shelby Tank Range enlargement I know the military have a few - very few - grounds.

Is it necessary to enlarge a piece of the present time when the Army's forces are cutting on troop numbers in my ship and air force personnel?

This proposal will destroy sixty years of timber management forever.

Yours Truly

857 Bundab Road
Wiggins, MS, 39577-9318 Burke V Cochran

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Stuart Colie

5 FEB 1992

STUART E. COLIE, PH.D.

119 WATERBURY DRIVE
OCEAN SPRINGS, MISSISSIPPI 39064

February 4, 1992

Mr. Tom Craven
Department of the Army
Mobile District Corps of Engineers
Inland Environment Section
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven

This letter concerning the open house hearing on the DeSoto National Forest-Camp Shelby EIS held ~~held~~ on January 8 in Gulfport is late, but I hope not too late. (Personal and family matters have kept me from it.) I attended the Gulfport hearing and left a written comment sheet. However, because of limited time and space (on the sheet) in which to prepare and present them, I felt my comments to be inadequate. Let me try again.

The open house format, stretched out over five hours (3-8pm) and compartmentalized into separate resource areas, in which individual guests with for the most part only generalized knowledge faced teams of specialists, who for the most part were committed to Camp Shelby's position, had two unfortunate aspects-- at least from the point of view of those guests who had reservations about or disagreements with that position.

The format tended to focus attention so much on the trees that the forest was lost from sight (no pun really intended re the National Forest). This plus the fact that guests bricked in separately over a five-hour period served to divide and conquer skeptics and opponents of the Shelby position.

My own experience was that the resource persons were generally well informed and informative, but that it was with exceptions hard to get clear and direct answers relative to the central question: how great would be the damage to the National Forest's basic purpose of preserving natural ecology and public recreation.

This was especially clear when, after making the rounds of the resource tables, I returned with a copy of the Sierra Club's January 8 press release (copy enclosed), which I obtained at the meeting from Louise Miller of the Club. I tried to get answers to the Club's main contentions about environmental damage. Most resource persons avoided the issue by contending that it was outside of their resource area. Only one, Dr. Harold Balbach, made a real attempt to deal with it, but he too failed, in my opinion, to meet head-on the central question (spelled out above) concerning impact on the National Forest's purpose.

My own view is, much as it was before the hearing, that the Shelby plan will do damage to the basic purpose of the National Forest: (to repeat) ecological and recreational preservation. I can only touch on the national security (military preparedness) and economic benefits (jobs in the area) aspects of the question in this letter.

My Ph.D. is in international politics (from Princeton) and much of my professional career (I am now a political science professor emeritus, Central Connecticut State University) has concentrated on that field with some emphasis on national security issues. My estimate is that the real national security gains from expanded National Guard tank training at Shelby would be minimal if not illusory, perhaps even counterproductive. The jobs aspect I consider more important, though real net gains hardly seem certain.

As I understand it, Alternative 3-B might provide a reasonable compromise solution. Believing that democratic politics is the art of compromise as well as of the possible, I cast one cautious vote for 3-B.

Sincerely,
Stuart E. Colie

Enclosure

cc: Senators Cochran and Lott, Congressman Taylor

48:1 Comment noted.

48:2 Comment noted. Under the National Environmental Policy Act and its implementing regulations, the purpose of holding a meeting with the public at this phase of the EIS process is to receive public input on questions and issues which they might have about the proposal or the Draft EIS. Preparers believe this function was met very well by the "open meeting" format used. It is not clear in what way the meeting did not serve this purpose.

48:3 The current and proposed uses are clearly authorized by law and regulation. Please see response to comments 26:4, 28:3 and 30:2, and misconception 22.

48:4 Comment noted. See also response to comment 48:3.

48:5 Comment noted. Also see response to comment 48:3. Preparers note that the "National Forest's purpose" as stated by Dr. Colie in his letter is not reflective of the U.S. Forest Service's mandate to provide for many uses of its lands. Military training is a fully recognized purpose, and this is stated in the Master Agreement between USDA and DOD as reproduced in Appendix A.

48:6 See response to comment 2:6.

48:7 Comment noted. No significant changes in employment are projected. See misconception 25.

48:8 Please see general misconception statement 7.

48:1

48:2

48:3

48:4

48:5

48:6

48:7

48:8

January 8, 1992
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

PRESS RELEASE

FOR MORE INFORMATION:
CONTACT: Louie Miller
859-1054

The Mississippi National Guard issued a press release on December 31, 1991 announcing three public hearings on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Camp Shelby Expansion. In this announcement the National Guard deliberately misrepresented the facts about the expansion. The release stated, "The proposed action does not involve a land expansion of the previously used National Forest lands nor the acquisition of additional lands." While it is true that the land will no longer be acquired by title, it is not true as implied, that this action does not involve expansion onto National Forest Lands not previously used for tank training. The obvious intent of this misrepresentation was to lull the public into believing that the Mississippi National Guard had altered their proposal to the extent that no significant impacts would occur. The actual facts regarding this proposal are as follows:

- 1) Under the National Guard's preferred alternative, # 1, 75% to 80% of the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area will be destroyed by tank training. (DEIS, Vol I, p. 3-73)
 - 2) The proposed tank maneuver areas will cover 39,772 acres of which the majority, 36,349 acres, has not been previously used for tank maneuvers. (DEIS, Vol I, p. 1-21)
 - 3) The new tank maneuver areas will require cutting 21,217 acres of our National Forest. Sixty-six percent (66%) of this acreage, 14,105 acres will be clear cut and the remaining thirty-three percent (33%), 7,112 acres will be thinned. This will result in the removal of over 77 million board feet of timber from our public lands. (DEIS, Vol I, p. 3-72 and 3-78)
- In conclusion, it is the opinion of the Mississippi Chapter Sierra Club that the destruction of over 62 square miles of our National Forest Lands cannot be construed as no significant impact. Through public insistence, the deadline for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement was extended to March 1, 1992. It is imperative that the people of Mississippi be informed of the true impacts of this proposal and the alternatives through an objective Environmental Impact Statement instead of the all too familiar deceptions evidenced by the Mississippi National Guard press release.

48:9 Comment noted.

48:10 Comment noted.

48:11 The acreage values quoted in this press release represent the *study area*, not the area upon which tracked vehicle maneuver is proposed to occur. Please see Section 1.2.1 of the Final EIS, and misconception statement 9.

48:12 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 48:11, 21:2 and 21:5.

48:13 See response to comment 3:12. See general misconception statement 9.

48:14 Comment noted.

48:9

48:10

48:11

48:12

48:13

48:14

STUART E. COLIE, PH.D.
118 WATEREDGE DRIVE
OCEAN SPRINGS, MISSISSIPPI 38864

February 19, 1982

The Honorable Trent Lott
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510-2403

Dear Senator Lott:

Although I doubt that my views on the Camp Shelby-DeSoto National Forest controversy can influence your already firmly stated position, as your constituent I want to let you know what they are. Hence the enclosures.

Let me briefly restate the crux of the argument advanced in the last three paragraphs of my letter to Mr. Craven of the Mobile District of the Army Corps of Engineers (copy enclosed):

- 1) The National Guard's preferred alternative #1 will seriously harm the environmental protection and public recreational purposes of the National Forest.
- 2) The National Security benefits of the expansion are too questionable to justify that harm.
- 3) The same holds true of the economic benefits (possible preservation or increase of jobs), especially in the long run.
- 4) Alternative 3-B, acceptable to most of the opposition, may minimize the harm to the Forest enough to make the uncertain national security and economic benefits ~~more~~ closer to providing adequate justification.

I would be glad to elaborate on any of these points, if you or any of your staff are interested. On the national security aspect of the issue I do feel that I have some professional expertise.

Sincerely,

Stuart Colie

Enclosures (2)

48:15 Comment noted.

48:16 Comment noted. See response to comment 21:8

48:17 See response to comment 2:6.

48:18 Please see response to misconception statement 25.

48:19 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 7.

48:15

48:16

48:17

48:18

48:19

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Lucy K. Conner

Mr. Conners, 2/27/92
I am totally opposed to
the Camp Shelby expansion.
I cannot in my soul believe
they need to destroy the
wildlife management area.
What are we becoming?
We must protect our animals
and plants for future
generations. It makes me
literally sick to think of
all the destruction that the
Guard wants to bring to our
beautiful forest. They have in
no way proven that this is
necessary.

Please don't let it happen!

Sincerely,
Lucy K. Conner
1378 Beach Blvd.
Biloxi, MS. 39530

49:1 Comment noted. Also see general misconception statement 5.
49:2 See general misconception statements 9, 11, and 14.
49:3 Comment noted.
49:4 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 9.
49:5 See response to comment 2:6. See general misconception statement 8.
49:6 Comment noted.

49:1

49:2

49:3

49:4

49:5

49:6

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Richard Conville

50:1 Comment noted. Also see general misconception statement 5.

50:2 See responses to comment 2:6. Also see general misconception statements 5 and 8.

50:3 No significant economic or employment benefit is claimed under any alternative. See also response to comment 2:6 and misconception statement 25.

50:4 The topic of damage to soils from tracked vehicle use is examined in some detail in Sections 3.3.1.3, 3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, and 3.5.2 of the Final EIS.

50:5 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 10:5, 14:46, and 35:6.

50:6 Comment noted.

205 Southampton Rd
Hattiesburg, MS 39401
February 26, 1992

Thomas M. Craven
Mobile District U.S. Corps of Engineers CESAM-PD-EL
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven,

I am writing to oppose the expansion of National Guard tank training into Desoto National Forest. There are several important reasons to avoid this move. 50:1

First, the future of the National Guard, particularly the 155th, is in doubt. The Cold War is over. The military is downsizing. Continued support of Shelby expansion borders on blatant pork barrel politics. The Guard should not be used as an employment agency! 50:2

Second, heavy tanks, upwards of 60 tons each, will do irreparable damage to the earth in the proposed area. Add to this, large scale clear-cutting and the proximity of the land to Black Creek and the damage to the environment is intolerable. 50:3

Our stewardship of the Earth is a fundamental value that must be preserved. Thank you for your consideration. 50:4

Sincerely,

Richard L. Conville
Richard L. Conville

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Deborah Cooley

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: Deborah Cooley		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Address: 252 Bryant Road Brooklyn Mississippi 39425		Hattiesburg, MS	
City:	State:	Zip:	January 8, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO. 1 RESOURCE AREA:			
Why was the study of the effects on the timber industry done for a period of 40 years? The study should have covered at least 60 to 70 years when the lost timber would have matured. Your study of the timber industry appears to be slanted in favor of the National Guard.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO. 2 RESOURCE AREA:			
The effects of noise from increased tank maneuvering, increased helicopters, and increased jet aircraft firing was not addressed pertaining to the Cypress Creek Missionary Baptist Church and their church services. This church is located on Highway 29 near the South Tank Crossing.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO. 3 RESOURCE AREA:			
Road Closures on Highway 29 and other area roads were not addressed. We travel these roads to work and to school.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO. 4 RESOURCE AREA:			
The effect on area school bus routes was not addressed. Many children live in the area there is an increased danger due to increased traffic and tank activity. This is a great concern!			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO. 5 RESOURCE AREA:			
What is the condition of the land to be turned back over to the Forest Service. Since this has been a tank maneuvering area, how long will it take and what action will have to be taken to make this land suitable for timber production?			

CESAR Form 1164-3 (One-Time)
Dec 91

Page 1 of 3

51:1 The estimates were prepared by Forest Service personnel. Timber industry effects were only calculated on 40 years because this is the period estimated for the last of the stands established in the 1930's to be harvested. Estimates of impacts to an industry for the forty year period involves a lot of conjecture. While growth estimates may be made beyond this period, guestimates of impacts to the timber industry much beyond ten years probably have questionable validity. It's felt calculating volume estimates beyond forty years would serve no useful purpose in the analysis of effects from which the decision maker will base his decision.

51:2 In response to questions such as yours, coverage of noise and other Quality of Life issues was expanded in the Final EIS. Please see Sections 3.4.11 and 3.5.8 of the FEIS.

51:3 Issues of road closure were also expanded. Please see Sections 3.3.3 and 3.3.5 of the Final EIS, and response to comment 2:244.

51:4 See response to comments 2:339 and 32:3. A maneuver training standing operating procedure, (SOP) will be developed, included in the Camp Shelby Regulations and passed to maneuver unit commanders. Included in this SOP will be procedures to notify the public as to where and when maneuver training will be conducted. Since maneuver will primarily be conducted during weekend and summer months there should be little or no interference with school activities or bus routes. Maneuver training will be scheduled to try to avoid the times when school is in normal session, when this cannot be avoided procedures to delay training while bus routes are run will be put in place. In any case the Perry County Superintendent of Education will be notified of maneuver activity when school is in session.

51:5 See Appendix O, Part 6 for a species/age class description of the areas to be returned to National Forest management. Non-stocked acres will need planting, and vary from about 600 acres (Alternatives 1, 3A, and 3B), through 1,900 acres (Alternative 2), to 2,700 acres (Alternatives 5 and 6). Planting of returned acres to longleaf pine should occur within a year from their release for normal management. Various site preparation methods will be employed depending upon the site involved and could include sub-soiling where soils are heavily compacted.

Timber stumpage values used in the analysis were from the Black Creek Ranger District timber sales for 1990 (Appendix O). These values should fairly represent the additional value of longleaf pine pole products since the area is representative of the District.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT.

Name: Deborah Cooley		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Address: 252 Bryant Road		Hattiesburg, MS	
City: Brooklyn	State: Mississippi	Zip: 39425	January 9, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 6 RESOURCE AREA:			
Who will be responsible for the road and bridge damage caused by National Guard?			
Will the National Guard keep public roads in good condition for local residents?			
Will compensation be made to the County for damage caused by National Guard?			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 7 RESOURCE AREA:			
Only hunting recreation during deer season was addressed. What about other			
hunting seasons: turkey, rabbit, squirrel? Will Camp Shelby stop maneuvers AND			
open the Forest to these sportsmen too?			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 8 RESOURCE AREA:			
Your noise study is a joke. According to the EIS, this study was done completely			
with a computer program. Why was no onsite monitoring done?			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 9 RESOURCE AREA:			
Firing and ordinance dethatation is not the only noise problem. Why was			
the increased tracked vehicle and increased helicopter and jet noises not			
addressed in the EIS? Why was the effects on the quality of life for the			
adjacent residents not addressed? Why was vibration from the tank firing not			
addressed?			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 10 RESOURCE AREA:			
The part of the noise study based on past noise complaints is inaccurate.			
Area residents have quit calling in complaints because the National Guard often			
ignored them and seldom made any effort to correct the problem. It is a wasted			
phone call. The last time I called Range Control, I was told by the Officer that			
he would come out in a few minutes to see what really happened.			

CESAH Form 1164-3 (One-Time)
Dec 91

Page 2 of 3

51:6 The Mississippi Army National Guard is responsible for maintaining roads and bridges on Department of Defense and State owned lands within the Camp Shelby boundaries, also MSARNG is responsible for maintaining roads and bridges on National Forest lands used by the military in the Special Use Permit area. The county boards of supervisors are responsible for maintenance of county roads and bridges and the State Highway Department is responsible for the maintenance of state roads and bridges.

51:7 Please see response to comment 51:6.

51:8 The current usage plan for tracked vehicle maneuver would allow the following hunting days for the species noted during the a typical hunting season in the affected areas:

Turkey: 42 of 44 days - even during the two days in which tank maneuver training would occur limited hunting could take place.

Squirrel: 92 of 98 days - limited hunting could take place on the six days in which track maneuver occurs.

Rabbit: 125 of 139 days. The fourteen days which track maneuver can be utilized for hunting on a limited basis.

Also refer to revised recreation use section in FEIS.

51:9 Comment noted. The computer program used is the only approved, mathematically supportable model to project average noise levels resulting from firing of heavy weapons. Such noise is very difficult to record or measure without special equipment. A field survey using such specialized equipment is proposed for 1994.

51:10 These issues have been examined at greater length in the Final EIS, Sections 3.3.5 and 3.5.8, among others.

51:11 Noise complaints are investigated and analyzed by Camp Shelby personnel to determine the cause and frequency of occurrence and to determine if a means exist to eliminate the problem. To date several noise problems have been solved due to these investigations; for example, flight activity is restricted on the air-to-ground ranges during the hours of church services on Sunday mornings.

The Camp Shelby Training Site Noise Complaint Standard Operating Procedure is to be contained in this environmental impact statement as an Appendix. Please see Section 3.2.4 and Table 3-14 of the Final EIS for an examination of the noise complaint history at Camp Shelby.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: Deborah Cooley		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS	
Address: 252 Bryant Road		Public Comment Meetings	
City: Brooklyn	Mississippi 39425	Gulfport, MS January 8, 1992	
State:	Zip:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 11 RESOURCE AREA:			
Why did the EIS not cover the impact on the citizens living adjacent to the proposed tank training area and firing ranges?			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 12 RESOURCE AREA:			
The EIS Military Training Noise Effects states that three areas of Zone II contours (62-70 decibels) are located near small communities. No maps show these communities and the effect on the residents is not addressed. THE EIS states that one Zone II area is near Grandee. No maps show this area. No one from the National Guard, Corps of Engineers, or the Forest Service could tell me where Grandee is located. I have lived in the area all my life, and have never heard of such a place.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 13 RESOURCE AREA:			
How are the area residents to be compensated for the loss in value of their land and homes due to the adjacent tank maneuvers and other training activities?			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 14 RESOURCE AREA:			
In the "List of Persons Contacted in the Course of This Study", why were no area residents included in the study?			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 15 RESOURCE AREA:			
The study on the red-cockaded woodpecker is inconclusive. An accurate count and identification of the woodpecker and active and inactive colonies can not be accomplished by helicopter.			

51:12 Comment noted. In response to the nature of the questions raised by the public at the meetings and through written comments, coverage of those issues termed "Quality of Life" was reorganized and expanded in the Final EIS. The issues raised by the commentator are among those specifically analyzed in the new sections. See also the response to comment 51:10.

51:13 The Draft EIS noted that there were some residents in one of the three areas where the noise contour program showed potentially unacceptable levels. Recalculations for the Final EIS, based on the present, much lower levels of ammunition firing, show no places where this zone falls outside the permit boundary. The case of Grandee is a separate, but interesting question. It is acknowledged that the name Grandee is no longer used by residents. Defense Mapping Agency maps do show a settlement of 4 to 8 buildings near the intersection of what are now known as Paret Tower Road and Whatley Road. The oldest map showing this dates from 1941, and shows many other very small settlements whose names are now forgotten as well. Section 2.3.2 of the Final EIS examines present noise conditions in greater detail than does the Draft EIS.

51:14 No compensation is proposed.

51:15 The Persons Contacted chapter in the EIS represents one in a series of processes to obtain information and opinion from agencies, elected officials and the public. The scoping meetings, and the public meetings on the Draft EIS in which you participated, and the letters, such as yours, which were received, are the designated means for the preparers to receive ideas, suggestions and opinions from the general public. Together, input has been received from a very wide range of persons with extremely varied points of view.

51:16 Helicopter flights were used only to augment surveys by researchers on the ground, not to substitute for them. Its specific purpose was to locate stands of timber which were potential habitat, and to be included in the ground survey. The researchers are aware of the helicopter survey's limitations for this species, and therefore the most labor-intensive efforts were directed toward the ground surveys, during which 100% of the potentially suitable habitat was examined on foot. During the surveys, previously occupied colony sites were a high priority and each was visited to determine its current activity status. Dr. Jerome Jackson, a nationally recognized RCW authority associated with Mississippi State University, provided instruction and guidance to the surveyors in addition to personally participating in some of the surveys.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Ron Cox

52:1 See response to comment 2:6. See general misconception statement 5.

52:2 See response to comment 35:12. See misconception statement 8.

52:3 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 10 and 11.

52:4 See response to comment 2:31. Refer to misconception 16.

31 JAN RECD

1-28-1992

MR. TOM CRAVEN,

SIR,

IN A TIME WHEN THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA IS THE UNDISPUTED WORLD
LEADER FOR PEACE, MY FAMILY, FRIENDS
AND I QUESTION THE NECESSITY OF
ADDING ANY ACREAGE TO THE PROPERTY
KNOWN AS CAMP SHELBY. THIS NEW
ACREAGE IS BEING SOUGHT FOR TRAINING
AT THE VERY TIME THE MILITARY IS
REDUCING ITS BUDGET FOR TRAINING,
PERSONNEL AND EQUIPMENT. OUR COUNTRY
IF NOT THE WORLD NEEDS THIS LAND,
UNDISTURBED AND PRISTINE! OUR FORESTS
ARE ESSENTIAL FOR PROVIDING MANY
"SERVICES" SUCH AS CLEAN AIR, WATER,
AND POLLUTION CONTROL.

I KNOW THAT THERE ARE MANY AREAS
OF THE COUNTRY OUT WEST WHERE USELESS
DESERT LAND EXISTS, FAR FROM POPULATED
CENTERS.

52:1

52:2

52:3

52:4

2.

IT SEEMS TO ME THAT LCCIC
WOULD SAY, PLACE A TANK TRAINING
SITE FAR FROM PEOPLE, NOT IN A
LUSH GREEN AREA FULL OF PEOPLE!
WE LOSE TOO MANY TREES UNNECESS-
ARILY IN PLACES WHERE WE HAVE LITTLE
CONTROL. WE DO NOT WANT THE
FORESTS OF MISSISSIPPI CLEARED,
BURNED, AND RIPPED TO SHREDS.

TO REVIEW, I OBJECT TO THE
CAMP SHELBY EXPANSION BASED ON:

- (1.) EXPANSION AT A TIME WHEN WORLD-
WIDE PEACE INITIATIVE IS ON.
- (2.) PROXIMITY TO PEOPLE WHEN MANY
UNPOPULATED DEAD AREAS ARE AVAILABLE,

THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO
COMMENT.

Ron Cox

52 CABLEBRIDGE RD.
PERKINSTON, MS
39573

52:5 Comment noted. See response to comment 52:4.

52:6 See coverage in Section 3.3.2.1.1 for a description of the proposed vegetation removal. There will be no burning of logging slash. This will be left to decompose naturally. The only burning will be the control burning as presently done except on a three year cycle when possible. Erosion control measures will smooth up and restore ground cover to areas disturbed by tank maneuvers.

52:5

52:6

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Stephen Craft

53:1 Comment noted. Please see misconception 12.

53:2 See response to comments 3:12, 16:2 and 18:1. See general misconception statements 4, 9, 10, 14, and 23. Please refer to section 2.4.6 of the Final EIS. Only 28% of the presently forested portions of the LRWMA will be modified as part of Alternatives 1 and 2 of the action plan. It is acknowledged that habitat changes will result, but these alterations will not "destroy" hunting in the LRWMA.

53:3 Comment noted. Please see additional coverage of these issues in Sections 3.1.3, 3.2.4, and 3.4.11 of the Final EIS.

53:4 See responses to comments 21:7, 35:12, and 2:6. See general misconception statement 8. Additionally, the M1 series of tanks has been improved over time to provide more firepower, increased crew safety and survivability, and faster maneuverability to remain a viable asset on the battlefield both now and in the future. The M1 tank is in production at this time. Production may slow or cease in the future only because requirements in the Army structure have been fulfilled. Our air power is very effective, but will not substitute for or replace the need for ground forces. The capability of the M1 tank is evidenced by the following quote by an Iraqi Battalion Commander captured by the 2nd ACR, "I went into Kuwait with 39 tanks. After 37 days of bombing, I still had 32. After 20 minutes against the M1A1, I have none." This quote was reported by SFC Darryl Cochran of the 2d ACR and was listed in a recent copy of the Soldier's Magazine. General Gordon R. Sullivan, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, made the following statement in the 1991 Army Greenbook, "Recent operations proved again the importance of the technological dimension of war. In the Gulf War, for example, our M1A1 Abrams tanks on the move in limited visibility acquired and killed Iraqi T-72s in defilade at greater than 3000 meters." 3000 meters is approximately two miles and the T-72 is one of the most modern Soviet-produced tanks.

1310 Queen Park Circle
Ocean Springs, MS 39564
February 26, 1992
Phone 601-875-8805

Thomas M. Craven
Corps. of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Ala 36628-0001

Dear Sir;

I ask that you not let the military gain any further control in the Desoto National Forest. I grew up hunting these woods and would like my grandchildren to be able to enjoy this wonderful heritage. The massive clearcutting proposed would virtually destroy the last best hunting in south Mississippi. It would greatly diminish the quality of life in south Mississippi.

At a time when the military is being cut back, and M-1 tank production has been halted they want to greatly expand tank maneuver areas in this beautiful forest. Since any future conflict is most likely to be in the desert and not the forests of

53:1

53:2

53:3

53:4

Europe, as in the so called "Cold War", the government wants to make a desert out of the Devote National Forest so that the terrain they train on will be like the terrain they might fight on. The wisest thing to do of course would be to train in the "desert areas" already in the western United States instead of making a desert of south Mississippi.

Sir There isn't a shadow of a doubt in my mind that this is about more than the National Guard and an adequate tank training area. It's even more than the value of the timber they are going to cut. It's about even more than the land they are trying to confiscate from the people of south Mississippi. I understand this is happening in other parts of the country.

If this were put to a vote, I am certain it would be voted down. I am a property owner & taxpayer in both Forrest County & Jackson County. I hardly know of anyone for it.

I respectfully ask you to courageously make this call from your heart - its your children's & grandchildren's heritage

53:5 See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31. See misconception statement 16.

53:6 Comment noted.

53:7 Comment noted.

53:8 See response to comment 28:3. See general misconception statements 5, 9, and 12.

53:9 Comment noted. The reference is unclear, and a response does not appear possible.

53:10 Comment noted.

53:11 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 9.

53:5

53:6

53:7

53:8

53:9

53:10

53:11

③

also
This is really about freedom in the
ultimate sense of the word. No one can
have freedom unless he is willing to give
it away. I respectfully ask you to
give the people of south Mississippi the
freedom to enjoy their heritage and at
the same time help ensure your freedom
and that of your children & grandchildren.

53:12

Hopefully yours
-Stephen A. Craft

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Carol Cubberley

54:1 Comment noted. See response to comment 2:6. See general misconception statement 8.

54:2 See response to comment 2:31.

54:3 Comment noted.

54:4 See response to comment 2:6.

54:5 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 7.

99 Trussell Rd.
Petal, MS 39465
February 20, 1992

Mobile District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers CESAM-PD-EI
Attn: Thomas M. Craven
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am writing to express my concern with the planned expansion of Camp Shelby for tank training in the Desoto National Forest. I am opposed to this plan at a time when loss of environment for wild species and human re-creation is a more pressing problem than is the threat of warfare that would require the use of troops in tanks. 54:1

I am convinced that

1) there are alternative sites already available for tank training available to the National Guard. 54:2

2) support for all areas of the military will be reduced. If this results in closure of Camp Shelby, Mississippi should direct its attention to new sources of jobs, and retraining for those jobs, rather than attempting to support the artificial survival of an industry no longer seen as essential to the national interest. 54:3

3) negative reports on Camp Shelby trained units activated during the Gulf War were not related to lack of training space. 54:4

I urge that no additional land be made available for tank training. Failing that, alternative #3B is preferable to alternative #1. The Leaf River Wildlife Management Area must be preserved and protected. 54:5

Yours truly,



Carol Cubberley

from the desk of...

John Curley

PHONE 544-4434
or 582-1555
2002 NORTH MAIN ST.
HATTIESBURG, MS 39401

2/17/92

*Mr. Tom Craven
U.S. Corps of Engineers
Mobile District
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL.*

Dear Mr. Craven,

*We look forward to your expanding
Camp Shelby. Please take the additional
measures necessary for the training
to protect our country. Most of us
are honored that you consider our
area desirable for this training.*

*The future protection of 250 million
people is more important than the deer
and trees and birds that will relocate.
It will be a pleasure to serve the
Troops and become acquainted
with them.*

Sincerely,

John Curley

CMB
FINANCIAL SERVICES

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
John Curley

55:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 5 and 25.

55:2 Comment noted.

55:3 Comment noted.

55:4 Comment noted.

55:1

55:2

55:3

55:4

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Caleb Dana

56:1 Comment noted.

56:2 Comment noted. Please also see responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31.

56:3 See response to comment 2:6.

56:4 See response to comment 21:3.

56:5 See response to comment 21:5.

56:6 Comment noted. Please refer to misconceptions 14 and 23.

56:7 See responses to comments 21:6 and 21:8.

February 23, 1992

360 Culley Drive
Jackson, Mississippi 39206

Mr. Thomas M. Craven
US Army Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001

Please enter my letter in the public record in opposition to expanded tank training in the Desoto National Forest. I grew up on the Mississippi Gulf Coast and have canoeed Black Creek and hiked in the Desoto National Forest. I object to this area, which has been bought and maintained by my tax dollars, being used in this way. Tank training should be performed on other military lands. In addition, I object to this use based on the following reasons:

- . No established mission or need 56:3.
- . Damage to fragile ecosystems which involve protected plants and animals 56:4
- . Loss of timber revenues and jobs from sustained forestry production 56:5
- . Loss of the Wildlife Management Area 56:6
- . Loss of recreational facilities to visitors 56:7

Sincerely,
Caleb H. Dana, Jr.
Caleb H. Dana, Jr.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Thomas Dana

91 JAN 1992

277 Hurricane Creek Road
Lumberton, MS 39455

January 27, 1992

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile Dist.
CESAM-PD-EI, Attn.: Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628

Dear Sir:

The following are my comments on the DEIS for Camp Shelby.

Appendix K (p. K-1) states that 64,246 acres of contiguous maneuver area are required to meet standard training needs. Even under the proposed preferred alternative (Alt.1) only 47,100 acres would be available, which would be further reduced to 40,400 when tank gunnery is being conducted (p.K-2). Just how the Army believes that training for combat readiness can be accomplished on only about two-thirds the area it says is needed should be thoroughly explained. Political influences should not be allowed to intervene. It appears these units should be sent elsewhere so that they can adequately train.

Furthermore the Executive Summary states that these training requirements are only for the short term (less than ten years) (p. ES-9). Since environmental impacts of the proposed action will last well beyond ten years, it would be imprudent to proceed until long term training needs have been clearly defined.

The guidelines under which the USFS grants special use permits provide no justification for resource destructive military activities (p. 1-7). The SUP sought also violates the USFS mission (p. 1-6).

Use of the term "mitigation" is basically a smokescreen designed to obscure the fact that generally irreparable environmental damage is being done. The nature of the positive-none-negative effects tables, which incorporate mitigation actions, is not quantitative; it is highly subjective. The comments that follow show where I disagree with the Draft EIS preparers' opinions in Tables ES-2 and ES-3.

Economy/Employment: More information is needed to properly assess the economic/employment losses projected under Alt. 6. What type of jobs are those that will be lost? What is the amount and nature of purchase orders from Camp Shelby to local businesses? What are the roadside businesses mentioned, and what is purchased from them? The loss of some of this economic activity may even be beneficial.

Outdoor Recreation: The survey technique used is flawed. People who find outdoor recreation in the presence of military training activity would not be expected to use the Camp Shelby area. The methods of selection of the survey population assured participation by those biased towards being unaffected by military training activity.

57:1 See response to comment 17:8.

57:2 Comment noted.

57:3 See response to comment 2:6, 2:31.

57:4 See response to comment 2:6.

57:5 See response to comments 2:31, 26:4, and 30:2, and misconception 22.

57:6 Comment noted. As utilized in this EIS, mitigation means "those measures designed to avoid or minimize environmental damage." Preparers do not believe any proposed actions will result in "irreparable damage." Please see also misconception 9.

57:7 Local suppliers benefit from the operational requirements of the installation as well as from the personal needs of the employees. Roadside businesses include gas stations, restaurants, and convenience stores. Refer to Section 3.3.4.1 in the Final EIS.

57:8 Comment noted.

57:1

57:2
57:3

57:4

57:5

57:6

57:7

57:8

An unbiased survey might be expected to show a potential increase in recreational use of the area, and accompanying increase in associated economic activity, upon cessation of military activity. (Also, I do not consider a possible increase in road hunting of deer a benefit.)

Threatened and Endangered Species: The proposed actions under the preferred alternative (Alt. 1) can only lead to further habitat destruction, fragmentation, and alteration. Species recovery is part of the Endangered Species Act. Such is not credibly possible under any alternative other than the no action one (Alt. 6). In fact, as an example, Appendix L states, "The view that military training promotes good gopher tortoise habitat is on the whole without any basis in biological fact." (p. L-1-9). This should apply to other TE & S species as well. Since federally managed lands are likely to be the major areas receiving adequate future protection, the net loss of 10,408 acres (pl-3-72) may not be trivial.

Timber: I believe that the losses of future timber volume and value (p. 0-8), EV funds (p. 0-3), and county returns (p. 3-80) under Alt. 1 have not been given adequate emphasis, nor have their gains under Alt. 6 been adequately treated. The loss of pole timber (the most valuable timber type) is not dealt with sufficiently (p. 3-135).

Natural Resources: The claim that natural resources will not be negatively impacted in the long term does not appear credible. Due to the nature of the proposed training exercises and their repetitiveness, severe soil and vegetation disturbances will be inevitable (even beyond the construction phase) (p. 3-125 to p. 3-128). To be very effective, the mitigation measures proposed must be implemented in a critically timely fashion. The number and distribution of weather events accompanied by heavy rainfall (Appendix H) is such that successfully accomplishing that task will frequently be impossible. The resulting runoff is bound to result in more serious erosion, loss of vegetative cover, wetland sedimentation, and surface water quality deterioration than admitted.

"Budgetary and logistical problems have resulted in approximately 20% of the area needing treatment going untreated" (p. 3-5). With the increased activity and number of sites that will need treatment under Alt. 1 and the likely continuation of tight budgetary conditions, it seems unlikely any improvement will be possible. Probably conditions will become worse.

The amount of ground water to be used in the proposed automated tank washes is not made clear nor discussed adequately.

Noise: At times where I live in the very southwest corner of Forrest County the sound of explosions (bombs, artillery shells, etc.) and machine gun fire can be heard. More annoying are the aircraft noises, though much of this may not be associated with Camp Shelby. The greatest nuisance occurs at night when my windows rattle sharply in response to explosive impact noises.

57:9 Comment noted.

57:10 Comment noted.

57:11 See additional coverage in Section 3.3.2.3.1 and the response to Commentor 21, comments 2 and 5.

57:12 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 3:12, 10:5, and 14:46.

57:13 See responses to comments 7:16 and 7:17.

57:14 Use of groundwater for the Tank Wash was examined briefly in Section 3.2.1.4 of the Draft EIS (Section 3.3.1.6 of the FEIS). This does not represent a new water usage. Vehicles are now washed by hand with high-pressure hoses, the wastewater and soil running into a drain, thus the recycling nature of the more modern tank wash (See Figure 1-23) has the potential to save tens of thousands of gallons of water per day. The quality of the water discharged to the drainage system is also improved.

57:15 Comment noted. The nature of present military-related noise is discussed in Section 3.1.5 of the Final EIS, where it is noted that this noise is certainly audible over a wide area, but unacceptable levels due to heavy weapons (impulse noise) are not expected outside the permit area. This section also mentions that the Air Guard jet aircraft operate outside the Camp Shelby area on various missions, but are not under control of Camp Shelby personnel. Many recent changes have been made in these aircraft operations to reduce noise effects to residents of the area (see Section 3.2.4 of the Final EIS).

Other: Although use of pesticides, especially herbicides, is covered in the previous SUP, no mention of actual usage or impact is made in the Draft EIS.

No treatment is given of possible impacts on air quality. It is admitted that dust, smoke, and emissions from open burning of unexploded ordnance will be generated. Nothing is presented regarding vehicular and aircraft exhaust emissions.

The environmental impacts of proposed facilities other than Tank Table VIII are left for later, after the issuance of a new SUP (p. 1-59). Impacts of these other projects should be included in the current EIS.

As a former environmental consultant who participated in such projects as an environmental assessment of military activities on Kwajalein Atoll and the deepening of San Diego Bay for the U. S. Navy, I find the DEIS in need of work and reevaluations. It is my opinion at this time, supported by Tables ES-2 and ES-3, that Alternative 6 is the best for the people of south Mississippi.

Sincerely,

Tom Dana

Dr. Thomas P. Dana
Ph.D., Biological Oceanography
University of California, San Diego

57:16 The topic of pesticide usage is discussed in Section 3.3.2.1.1 of the Final EIS, and summaries of the assessments prepared for this usage are included in Appendix V. Clause Number 45 of the proposed Special Use Permit (SUP) covers use of pesticides on National Forest lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service. This clause is located in Appendix A, page A-2-7 of the environmental impact statement (EIS).

The use of pesticides and alternatives to their use are addressed in the EA for Herbicide Application on Camp Shelby Range Facilities, dated August 2, 1991, and the EA for Insecticide Application for Red Imported Fire Ant Control on Camp Shelby Range Facilities, dated August 2, 1991 (see Appendix V to the Final EIS). Camp Shelby has a Pest Management Plan which addresses the use and storage of pesticides within the Cantonment Area for routine grounds operations.

57:17 Neither the scoping process (Section 1.1.7.1 of the Final EIS) nor general scientific concern has focused on the question of emissions from burning of propellants as a major air quality concern. There is no burning of unexploded ordnance, per se, at Camp Shelby. The question of dust and smoke generation was raised in the public comment process, and has been examined in the Final EIS (Sections 3.1.3, 3.2.4, 3.3.3 and 3.4.11).

57:18 Comment noted. As described in Section 1.5 of the Final EIS, this study has examined most of the construction projects in an initial feasibility sense, i.e. is it reasonable to attempt to propose such construction. This EIS may be considered programmatic with respect to the major projects. Since each project must be evaluated prior to construction, and this evaluation approved by the Forest Service, no major project will be initiated without adequate examination of site specific environmental consequences.

57:19 Comment noted.

Feb. 20, 1992

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Carolyn D'Aquilla

Thomas M. Craven
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Ala. 36628-0001

Dear Sir:

The needless destruction of so much of Blount National Forest is of grave concern to those of us who live and raise our families in Mississippi. I would like to voice my opposition to the proposed expansion of tank training for the following reasons:

1. There is no established need or mission for this training.
2. There have been recent reductions in the military. Production has been halted on the M-1 tank. Why expand training?
3. The people who live near this area will be deeply affected, their lives disrupted by year-round noise pollution and they will be unable to travel freely in their own neighborhood.
4. There will be untold loss of recreational facilities to visitors nationwide.
5. There will be lost timber revenues from clear-cutting and thinning procedures.

58:1

58:2

58:3

58:4

58:5

58:6

58:1 Comment noted. Please see misconception statements 9 and 17.

58:2 See response to comment 2:6.

58:3 See response to comments 33:3, 21:7, 2:6 and 53:4.

58:4 See response to comments 21:4 and 21:6.

58:5 See response to comment 21:8.

58:6 See response to comment 21:2.

6. We will have damage to fragile ecosystems which involve protected animals and plants. 58:7
7. We will lose forestry and forest-related jobs. 58:8

There simply seem to be no logical reasons for this expansion and destruction.

Please use your influence to stop the abuse of our people and property.

Sincerely
Mrs. Carolyn M. D'Agrella
41 Linda Lane
Long Beach MS 39560

February 25, 1972

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Sandy Davenport

Thomas M. Craven
Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2383
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

I am stating my objections to expanding the tank training
at Camp Shelby using acreage in the Le Fite National Forest.

1. The tanks will cause damage to the forest and cause soil
erosion.
2. It will create noise in the wilderness area, along Black Creek
below Highway 29.
3. The location is too valuable to the sportsman and timber industry
to compromise even a small amount for any reason.

Sandy Davenport

13465 E WORTHAM RD
SARASOTA MS 39574
PH 832 1373

59:1 Comment noted. Please also see misconception statements 5 and 12.

59:2 Comment noted. Please see responses to comments 10:5 and 14:46.

59:3 Comment noted. Please see the discussion of this issue in section 3.1.5.1. No
changes in noise levels are proposed as a result of this action.

59:4 Comment noted. Please also see responses to comments 21:8 and 21:5.

59:1
59:2
59:3
59:4

59:5 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 9.

59:6 Comment noted. See response to comment 2:31.

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of :

15 Sandy Davenport
16 13465 East Wortham Road
17 Saucier, Mississippi 39574

18 Why I'm opposed to relinquishing any of the national
19 forest to the military is because I think it is going to be
20 more valuable to the general public as a national forest as
21 it is now than it will be as a training base. I think over
22 the period of time that the most valuable thing that south
23 Mississippi has got is there abundance of national forest
24 and public lands.

59:5

25 I'm retired Air Force myself. I feel like I'm fairly
1 patriotic, but I feel like this is a waste of the public
2 land when there is land available that is much more suited
3 for this type training than the land in the Leaf River Area
is. That's basically the reason I'm opposed to it.

59:6

59:7 Comment noted.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FIRMLY

[illegible]

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
M.G. Davis

- 60:1 Comment noted. Please refer to Misconception 14.
60:2 Comment noted.
60:3 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 16.
60:4 See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31.

2-2-02

M. G. Davis
117 Suffolk St.
Long Beach, MS 39066

Mr. Thomas W. Craven
Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

I got these notices out of the letters to the Editor of the Sun-Herald newspaper for 2-24-02 yesterday. They will point up the problems of both the U.S. Forest Service and the Army/Wall. Guard resolve to completely (practically) take over and destroy (yes, I said destroy-I have already all the environmental impact studies/etc. that have been run out by our Congressmen in D.C. a long time ago) our beautiful River Wildlife Mgmt Areas and the DeSoto forests....

My own comments about this are again on their way to the U. S. Congressmen for our whole state and locale (Hise. of Reps. only). I have reproduced said write up from a long, long letter to all three of those gentlemen, and in turn am enclosing an excerpt of that ltr. entitled part 2 of the ltr. The rest of that ltr. is not germane to this proposition we are talking about herein.

I hope that you read this in part with the profundity it really needs, as I am almost any further tank encroachment into the said areas, and I have made the points about such in the ltr. part 2 enclosed.

Anyone who has any conception of what a ground war is like, would shudder to see what the Army/Wall. Guard proposes to do in the DeSoto Forest areas and Leaf River....

I am retired and try to contribute a small amt toward the Miss. Wildlife Mgmt Fund on my State income tax form each year, as I figure it is small remuneration of the quality of life down here.

I am the first to say hooray for our boys in khaki/etc. whether the Cold War is on or not, and for many years was involved in the Defense industry of this nation. I am just an ordinary guy, who has seen not the beauty of the DeSoto forest, but that of the Grand Canyon, Rockies, Sierras, Sacajawes, etc. and am now too old to do much "hiking or walking". Also I was never what you might call an "outdoors nut"...I like swimming, skiing and such, but have been away from that much too long I fear. But also I cannot catch a fish to save my neck! And unfortunately, neither can my boy! But I dearly love the drives through the byways and highways of this state, and many others.

I understand the job implications of the non-support of this Army request; I understand that the Army/Guard needs somewhere to maneuver, for we never know when the troops will be needed again. But surely, after reading my ltr. part 2, maybe some other way may be found to do this training, or part of it in another environment? And I would hope that the Army would not be so spiteful, if turned down, that it would withdraw all support and use of Camp Shelby. After all, Missisippians have always been quick to answer the call to arms by this country, as well as the rest of the States of this glorious Union.

Come, let us reason together...is there perhaps some other solution...you all (the Army/Wall. Guard) must know of some other responsible, non-militaristic way to get the desired training that our tanks require? I hope so. God bless each of you and may He guide all of you in the final analysis of this problem...

Very truly yours,
M. Craven

2-25-92

-2-

M. G. Davis
113 Suffolk St.
Long Beach, ME 39560

1. Lets get the most touchy local subject off first...the Camp Shelby tank operational area which wants to expand into practically all of the rest of the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area. Incidentally, while we are on this subject, that expansion area (SJA) has some of the few hardwood stands left in this state, which is under the Wildlife Management of the U. S. Forest Service/etc., and this little bit of news I just read/~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ it seems the U.S. Forest Service, who is SUPPOSED TO BE PROTECTING OUR FORESTS FOR ALL THE CITIZENS OF OUR WONDERFUL COUNTRY, has, over the years gotten into destroying (by poisoning), so they can be harvested, a lot of our hardwood trees (I assume in various parts of the country as letters to the Editor wait a minute- I just opened the same yesterday morning paper to that section-where I got the Leaf River Mgmt thin from, and lo and behold there was the articles about both the Leaf River, and the one on what I am saying about the U.S. Forest Service!) See enclosed numbers 1x 1a-1b-1c. Why does the Forest Service do this??? So they can plant more stupid slash pine/other pine for harvesting!!!! This is idiotic carried to the extreme! Who in Washington or Jackson, Miss. who is responsible for each goings on by the very ~~XXXXXXXX~~ bureaucrats who are supposed to be PRESERVING THE FORESTS INTACT AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE!!!!

a) Now as for the expansion of the tank facilities at Camp Shelby, I am afraid Sen. Lott (particularly) is not going to like this, but frankly, when I saw in yesterday's paper the real, large size of these areas, I was flabbergasted! The Natl. Guard/Army proposes to practically take over the whole thing! Why do they want to do this??? It certainly has nothing to do with training for combat, per se, as tanks are notorious for not being able to navigate forests near as well as they can open terrain (which is about the only place they are effective) ask the Vietnam veterans, the Korean vets, the WWI vets-how about mine fields in the forests (much easier to conceal) How about the other little tricks the Germans/Chinese/ho Oh whatever have pulled in the jungles and forests!

b) Why not use the tanks in the Colorado grasslands? Where there is already a setup for them to train with. Or better yet, why not ask our Central American friends (as give them enough money/arms) to let us fly the tanks down there (under combat conditions-like the airlift to Saudi Arabia in Desert Storm) After all, the Army/Navy/Marines/Air Force/Pentagon whiz kids say that "the war of the future will be small, mobile efforts- now that the Russian threat is downgraded (and frankly tho, I don't believe this yet until they actually start converting their ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ soldiers to civilians!); and the Viet threat is downgraded; and the Korean(North) is downgraded. Of course, we forget to mention the Chinese, who are now building up their armies and sur-tils and tanks and etc. at an alarming rate, but no one can tell Pres. Bush that-he thinks trade with those thinkers is great-I'm talking about the communist rulers of China-not the poor down-trodden masses, who will, when told to, fight like crazy against us or anyone else!).

c) Misasiduri has precious few acres of prime nature-oriented areas for people to go to; to camp out under the stars; to "commune with nature"; to see the "Glories of the God who made us all (and is downright mad at most of us for what we are ALREADY DOING TO HIS WORLD!).

- 2d) I see our Congressional ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ group all for "more jobs" no matter what; but when the going gets tough, such as saying no to "any more encroachment of our wetlands/forests/marshes/bayous/etc.", and the old "you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours" politics start working their sneaky ways..(its too bad that Congress has worked this way for two centuries-there has got to be a better way!)

60:5 The hardwood stands within the proposed maneuver areas are not planned for maneuver activity. They occupy wetter sites and will be off-limits to tracked vehicles. Most hardwoods occurring in the pine stands slated for treatment and tank maneuvering will be left for partial concealment and to provide food and cover for wildlife. Please also see response to 30:2.

60:6 See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:32. Please also see misconception statements 5, 12, and 23.

60:7 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:31 and misconception 16.

60:8 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 10, 11, and 22.

60:9 Comment noted. Please see misconception 25.

Long Beach, MS 39560
113 Suffolk St.
M. G. Davis

-3-

2-25-92

So, lets hear it for the whole people of this country-not just our local cow-
pers and hikers and naturalists; but for all the visitors who might come here,
and wish to partake of the scenic sights this magnificent state has to offer!
Why, who knows, all those visitors, plus all the wonderful Mississippians who
like the great outdoors (and what kid doesn't?) may well bring in more for the
state of Miss. than all the tanks in the world. Just ask any tank man what the
tanks do to the open desert/grasslands (I feel sorry for Colorado also!), let a-
lone what they do to the forests! God bless America and onward toward final
FAME FOR THE WORLD!

60:10

60:11

xxx c) Ooh, I forgot to get enough carbon to write the Pres. and Mr. Thomas
M. Grave, Corps of Engineers/etc. about this; do you suppose one of our good
congressmen's staff person could call and/or send a copy of this to him for me?
The whole address is in the article..oops, sorry, I forgot, you staffers must
do other things..thats OK, I'll send a copy of this to him myself....thanks
anyway!

60:12

xxx f) Also, while I am on this subject, let me digress enough to say I dont
know about other Mississippians, but I vote also NO TO NUCLEAR DUMP, NO TO OIL
IN OUR LIKSTONE CAVERNS, NO TO NUCLEAR WAST IN OUR CAVERNS, NO TO OUT OF STATE
TRASHY MEDICAL WASTE BURNING FROM OUT OF STATE/ETC/ETC!!

.. .

Sun Herald letters to the editor
attached to this letter not reproduced
in this FEIS.

60:10 Comment noted.

60:11 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 60:7.

60:12 Comment noted. The EIS being prepared does not propose to perform any of
these actions.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Denny Denton

Army Corps of Engineers
ATTN: Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

February 24, 1992
Denny Denton
717 Wortham Drive
Grapevine, Texas 76051
817-488-3306

Dear Mr. Craven:

THE DESOTO NATIONAL FOREST

"The greatest good for the greatest number of people."

Beyond the politics of it all, this Nation stands to lose a priceless piece of land created long ago for the good of everyone. We the people, in partnership with the DESOTO for nearly 60 years, could never have imagined we were merely caretakers of this forest... That one day it would be fully nurtured and mature enough to provide a suitable training ground for tanks.

Whereby LIMBER is Mississippi's largest industry: Those same politicians who fight to clear-cut nearly 14,000 acres (plus thin 7,000 more), conveniently ignore the hundreds of thousands of dollars the forest brings into local counties each year (for roads and schools, etc.). They totally overlook lumber industries, loggers, wildlife personnel, and forest management - the many jobs that would be lost. In fact, if Camp Shelby were closed, the DESOTO NATIONAL FOREST could be repatriated and then reforested in its entirety, which would benefit the local economy immeasurably... As originally intended. Already, there are approximately 55,000 acres decreed unsuitable for centuries to come due to unexploded ordnance! Why should we sacrifice any more of this valuable land?

Rep. G.V. "Sonny" Montgomery was recently quoted (HATTIESBURG AMERICAN, page 10A, January 18, 1992): "If you don't get that additional space), those tanks are going to be moved out. I keep telling people that, and they don't listen. They think I'm whistling Dixie." As you read this, you can't help but wonder how Rep. Montgomery got to be the designated spokesman for the National Guard at Shelby - when it's not even his district! Why does he adamantly favor this deal, to the point of issuing so many of these unsubstantiated threats. It becomes quite obvious that Rep. Montgomery is a retired General of the Mississippi National Guard. I hesitate to call it conflict of interest but you can be sure of one thing: With his high ranking on numerous military committees in Washington, Rep. Montgomery doesn't give a damn about THE DESOTO NATIONAL FOREST in South Mississippi, nor does he care about the heritage and beauty it represents!

What difference does it make anyway? With billions of dollars in military cutbacks looming, there's no longer a "need" to have this public land. Shelby was originally established to train with tanks in terrain comparable to eastern Europe (as in WWII). That threat is gone. So, why should the National Guard now have its own private "country club"? The DESOTO NATIONAL FOREST was established to provide the "greatest good for the greatest number of people". It's an unfathomable shame that Mississippi's politicians don't concur!

Denny Denton
Sincerely, Denny Denton

61:1

61:2

61:3

61:4

61:5

61:6

61:7

61:1 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 25.

61:2 See Section 3.2.4.2 and 3.5.9.2 for the discussion of impacts to the timber industry and forestry related jobs. See also response to comment 21:5.

61:3 Refer to Sections 2.6.1 and 3.3.4 for an examination of the employment and economic effects of present and proposed operation of the Camp Shelby training site. Please also see misconceptions 24 and 25.

61:4 No use of live ammunition is proposed in any area not now used for that purpose. The origin of the 55,000 acre figure in your comment is unclear. If the areas in question represent historic impact areas, they have been cleared for training, public use, and timber production.

61:5 Comment noted.

61:6 See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:32.

61:7 Your comment is noted. See also comment 28:3.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Walter Denton

29 NOV REC'D

E-1

November 25, 1991

PO Box 219
Brooklyn, MS 39425

TO: U.S. Army District Engineers and
U.S. Forest Service

RE: Request for Extension on Responses to DeSoto EIS

62:1 Comment noted. Three public meetings were planned for early January, and were held as planned. In response to many requests, the public comment period was extended until March 1, 1992. In practice, all comments received at any time have been included in our considerations.

62:1 Many of our people have asked me to request an extension for our response time to the EIS just released on DeSoto Forest land. We base this request on the following reasons:

1. The timing of your release makes our response time fall in the middle of a busy holiday season. Many have trips planned and other activities already planned, thus curtailing about one month of the time you have given us.
2. There is much difficult material to digest, and we need more time to study it.
3. Since you had ample time, with paid staff and available assistance, we certainly need more time, working as we do without those benefits.
4. There is, after all, no great rush. This is a serious proposal, and serious consideration must be rendered.

We need, at the least, an extra sixty (60) days for our consideration.

Sincerely,

Walter M. Denton

Walter M. Denton
LCol, Ret., U. S. Army
Citizens Against the Land Steal

601 544 0617

February 19, 1992

PO Box 219
Brooklyn, MS 39425

Army Corps of Engineers
ATTN: Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Mr. Craven:

Your lengthy and confusing Environmental Impact Statement will not be read or understood by the average citizen; yet that average citizen stands to lose his national forest land and will help to pay, through his taxes, the tremendous cost which this entire process has entailed. Probably not one person in a thousand has even seen this document, much less read it. This in itself seems a crime against the people, for whom our national forest was first established.

Along these same general lines, it has never been made clear just how this EIS was allowed to proceed. A moratorium on further military land grabs was issued by Deputy Sec. of Defense Donald Atwood on Sept. 13, 1990. Yet before his ink was dry, an exclusion to this moratorium was granted for the DeSoto land grab by Susan Livingstone, Ass't. Sec. of the Army, on Sept. 21, 1990. Just what political influences from the MS congressional representatives helped to sway this exception? The people of MS have not been told the truth.

We know too that the National Guard has expended unlimited resources to propagandize their cause too at taxpayers' expense. Some accounting should be rendered to the people for massive publicity for influencing important media and community people by way of tours, helicopter rides, and general "winning and dining." How much money has been expended along these lines and who paid?

Our specific comments relating to the EIS cover several areas, to include the following:

1. The EIS would appear to be tainted by conflict of interest. Since it was conducted largely by the Army Corps of Engineers, the National Guard, and your hand-picked personnel, your ultimate and favorable conclusions for Shelby's expansion with tanks into the Wildlife Management Area were anticipated and offered no surprises. We had early requested that more neutral entities conduct this EIS, should it be allowed to proceed in contradiction to Atwood's moratorium of Sept. 13, 1990.

2. The facts of the case do not support the general summation that the DeSoto National Forest would experience no "long term damage," should tanks be expanded into the Wildlife Management Area. When over 14,000 acres will be clear-cut and over 7,000 acres will be severely thinned, at whatever pace, this is nothing short of severe and lasting damage to a pristine forest which belongs to the people, not tanks. Nor has the lasting effect of soil erosion and other detrimental damage been accurately measured.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF Walter and Virginia Denton

63:1 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 12.

63:2 Comment noted. Distribution of the Draft EIS was made to almost 1,000 officials, libraries, interest groups, and persons in response to the requirements of 40 CFR 1502.19.

63:3 The "exclusion" was limited to continuation of the EIS studies. See also the response to comment 16:10.

63:4 The Mississippi National Guard is actively involved in the Civic/Community Leader Airlift program that authorizes community leaders to visit sites where National Guard personnel are training to enhance the civilian guests' understanding of the Department of Defense by giving them insight into National Guard operational and support missions and training. We carry these civilian leaders to such locations as Ft. Hood, TX, Ft. Benning, GA, but focus primary attention on Camp Shelby because this is where most of our personnel train. At Camp Shelby, they are acquainted with the training of personnel, primarily from their hometowns, but also of the facilities available at Camp Shelby, the Nation's largest reserve training site. Civic leaders fly flown in conjunction with air crew proficiency-training missions, within command flying-hour allocations, and at no additional cost to the government. Civic leaders are drawn from a broad variety of community leadership, professions and businesses. They are responsible for the costs of food, lodging and incidentals in connection with the trips. This program is conducted throughout the year and has been underway for the past 15 years. The Mississippi Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve has a companion program that follows the same guidelines but involves the civilian employers of National Guard personnel. The Civic-Community Leader Airlift Program is conducted under the guidance of NGB Pam 360-5.

63:5 Comment noted. To the contrary, preparers believe that it is much more efficient for trained persons familiar with the military mission to evaluate the effects of that mission. This familiarity does not represent a conflict of interest, and, rather than a close-knit group of persons inside the system, field studies and writing were conducted by an interdisciplinary group of more than 60 persons from many locations, a majority of them not Government employees.

63:6 Please refer to responses to comments 3:12, 7:23, and 17:5. See general misconception statements 10 and 11.

63:7 The consequences of possible soil loss have been a major focus of both the Draft and Final EIS (Sections 3.1.1.3, 3.3.1.3, and 3.3.1.4).

3. With above loss of timber, there will be a loss of revenue to counties from Forest Service. The EIS does not address how such funds would be made up. The only source would be from the taxpayers, thus making a double loss for them. Perry Co. would lose the most, and perhaps that's why Perry County officials have been wined and dined by Shelby officials only recently. Where would these make-up funds come from, but from the taxpayers?
4. The Corps of Engineers already administer some lands in this area. How much are they paying to Perry and Forrest Counties for loss of revenue on these lands? The public is not aware of any payment.
5. Noise pollution was not adequately addressed in the EIS. As far as we're able to ascertain, you've used a study from Dahlgren, Virginia (Date?) which does not seem applicable here, with noise from firing and over-head planes (Appendix I, page 1-8). You say this area contains some "scattered rural residents, . . . who may be annoyed and could complain about the noise environment." Truth: there are many rural residents affected and they have complained, loudly and over a long period of time. The only satisfactory study on noise pollution would be an in-area study, measuring the distance and seriousness of this noise pollution. We have, for instance, written you in our earlier report that some of our walls have cracked from the jarring noise of firing at Co. Shelby. These we could show you. Other people here in Brooklyn have complained of jars being knocked from shelves on numerous occasions. Our light fixtures during the summer are jarred on most week-ends, where the firing has been known to go on until late at night, sometimes till near 2 a. m., thus affecting our sleep. On various occasions, we've complained to our county supervisors and to Shelby itself. None of this was taken into your study, even though several people reported on it in open meetings and in letters to you. Why was no study done in this area?
6. The role of fire has not been treated. You say on p. 1-28 that this issue is treated in Section 3.5.4.2, but it is not treated there.
7. You have studied many species, but not the human one. Many people who will be surrounded by your tanks and guns have not been consulted. Their lives have already been severely impacted by blocked roads, noise, and other inconveniences, but they have not been consulted by your supposed experts. Why not?
8. In spite of all your proclamations to the contrary, the recreational use of our national forest will be severely curtailed if the forest is surrendered to M-1 tanks. It could be no other way. Thousands of visitors use these facilities every year, and they too add to our economy.
9. People have reported to us that they own mineral rights to some of this territory. This issue has not been addressed in your EIS.
10. What about the wetlands? President Bush has pledged that there will be no loss of wetlands; yet the wetlands have already been damaged in this national forest by erosion, etc. How is this area to be used by tanks going to protect our wetlands in the DeSoto?

- 63:8 Your comment is noted. Section 3.3.2.3.1 examines effects on timber yields, and Section 3.3.4.3.1 contains an expanded discussion of effects on county returns.
- 63:9 The reference to administering lands is unclear, as is the type of revenue lost. In any case, there are no regular payments made. If timber is sold from lands owned by the Department of Defense, a portion of the net receipts is returned to the county in which the timber was grown. Since most of the DOD owned land is of recent acquisition, few sales have been made to date.
- 63:10 Comment noted. Preparers cannot determine what Virginia study is referred to by the commentator. The Army Environmental Hygiene Agency, located in Maryland, has been in charge of both the on-site studies and the modeling of expected noise levels related to weapons use. In all cases, however, the data have been from actual Camp Shelby ammunition expenditure records.
- 63:11 Updated information has been made available on the number and location of rural residents, and greatly expanded coverage of these issues has been added to the Final EIS (Sections 2.3.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.5, 3.2.4, and 3.3.3).
- 63:12 A new on-site noise study is scheduled for 1994, and settled areas outside the permit area will be included, as they were in 1988.
- 63:13 Preparers suggest continuing to call Camp Shelby to report each incident, since the logs of the noise complaint system are used to plan mitigation procedures. The system and results are included in Section 3.2.4 and Table 3-14 of the Final EIS.
- 63:14 The issue was treated briefly at Section 3.5.4.2 of the Draft EIS, as stated, but was a reference to an extensive USFS study of the topic. In the Final EIS, this coverage has been significantly expanded. See response to comment 14:37.
- 63:15 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 51:15.
- 63:16 Hunting is the principal use of the National Forest land which will be impacted by the creation of any new tank maneuver area. What effect this will have on hunting visitation to the LRWMA and surrounding lands is difficult to ascertain. A case may be made for decreased use due to a reduction in the experience of hunting an extensive woodland, and a case may also be made for increased use due to easier access and visibility which should increase hunter success. Other recreation use is concentrated along Black Creek. There should be no additional impacts to the recreation experience along the creek. Current impacts are the result of noise from range firing and aircraft. This usage is not expected to increase under the new special use permit. Please also see response to comment 21:8 and additional coverage in Section 3.3.3.4.
- 63:17 Coverage has been added to Sections 2.6.2, 3.1.4.2, and 3.3.4.2 of the Final EIS.

11. You talk about "mitigating" the soil after tanks have gutted it out. Your mitigation seems to consist of smoothing out the terrain and then planting grass seed. After you do this, of course, the next training session comes along and tears it up again. We have pictures of silt running down into wetland creeks from this constant damage. We don't believe you can "mitigate" soil that has been and will be constantly run over by 60-ton tanks.
12. As with the wetlands, your study of threatened and endangered species in the DeSoto was not adequate. Common sense determines that the fragile ecosystem of this forest will be severely damaged by heavy tanks, no matter what supposed experts say.
13. You engaged the Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (CERL) to rush up this EIS with many fancy graphs and charts. We learned at your meeting to explain the EIS at Gulfport that this same group is being retained to implement your programs espoused in the EIS at Camp Shelby. This appears to be another direct conflict of interest. It is expected that they would advocate Shelby expansion if only to perpetuate their own positions and longevity. They don't know the area and don't care about the citizens of the area or the national forest and its history.
14. It was also noted that this EIS spent considerable time in glorifying the history of the National Guard. What was blatantly missing was the history of the Forest Service and its efforts since the 1930s to establish and maintain this DeSoto Forest. For balance, the history of the DeSoto should have been given equal consideration.
15. Camp Shelby is often touted as being the largest training area in the country. This is erroneous propaganda, since much of the land Shelby uses under special use permit is the DeSoto National Forest which belongs to the people. Take away this forest land and then Shelby is not the largest training area in the country.
16. No consideration was given in the EIS to laws which govern the DeSoto National Forest. To turn over a national forest to tank training would appear to be illegal, going against every established law for its use. In 1926, the MS Legislature passed the Enabling Act which authorized the purchase of private lands for national forest lands with taxpayers' money. The DeSoto Forest is a result of this Act, and it has taken several decades to establish this forest, under the management of the Forest Service. In 1960, Congress passed the Sustained Yield Act which called for the renewable resources of the forests (timber, recreation, water, wildlife, etc.) to be managed "So that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the needs of the American people"--the people who own these forests. How then can these laws be circumvented by our Forest Service or the National Guard? Under the strictest sense, no tanks should ever have been allowed in any national forest. By what hook or crook are these laws being evaded now?
17. In connection with no. 16, there is a Master Agreement between the Dept. of Defense and the Dept. of Agriculture (Appendix 10-10, 10-363) which has been totally ignored, thus allowing this expensive EIS process to

63:18 Comment noted. Extensive measures are proposed to minimize or preclude loss and damage of wetlands (Sections 3.4.2, 3.4.4, and 3.4.5 of the Final EIS).

63:19 Comment noted. Soil damage concerns other than revegetation have been examined in the Final EIS (Section 3.4.3, for example). Please also see response to comment 63:18.

63:20 Please see response to comments 21:3 and 26:2, and Section 3.3.2.5 in the Final EIS.

63:21 Comment noted. The coordination of the development of land management initiatives and the preparation of the EIS is viewed, within the Army, as an example of synergism, coordination, and minimization of duplication of effort. The long-term plan for ITAM has always been to transfer responsibility to on-site management, with performance by locally hired staff and cooperating in-state universities. This is taking place at Camp Shelby.

63:22 Comment noted. The history of forest management in the area is examined in Section 2.4.3 of both the Draft and Final EIS.

63:23 The Camp Shelby Training Site is composed of property under many types of use and ownership. See Section 2.5.1 of the Final EIS. The majority of land at Camp Shelby is USFS administered National Forest Land used for military training under Special Use Permit (SUP). The SUP area in addition to State and DOD owned lands comprise the largest reserve component training site in the U.S. See also the response to comment 10:2.

63:24 The Enabling Act authorized purchase by the Federal Government. These lands are administered by the Forest Service for many purposes. Please see responses to comments 28:3 and 30:2 for a discussion of the authority for military use of National Forest lands.

63:25 See response to comment 2:31.

proceed against Atwood's moratorium on land grabs (Sept., 1990) and costing several million dollars (taxpayers' money). I-C of this Master Agreement clearly states that the Dept. of Defense must first establish that there are no other lands under its administrations which could be used for Shelby's expanded tank training. THAT HAS NEVER BEEN ESTABLISHED. How could this process even have begun without the enforcement of this Master Agreement? Again the people who own the DeSoto Forest have been deceived, and the taxpayers have been hoodwinked. As in the previous secret deal to swap DeSoto land for worthless land in Colorado, the people have been deceived and left out of the process. Working without funds or paid staff, the people themselves have had to work against the tremendous power machine of the National Guard and false information, which, incidentally, has been using taxpayers money to propagandize the greed of the National Guard.

18. And speaking of false information, on page 1-3, Chapter 1, of your EIS, your map shows Camp Shelby taking in all land right into the Gulf of Mexico and Alabama, even extending the lower left corner into Louisiana. What? Who drew this map, and does it represent your larger greed and what you intend to do? Is this an example of your experts at CERL and their master plan?

19. There is currently no established mission for tank battalions that would tear up our DeSoto National Forest. The cold war is over, and military operations are scaling down. Cheney has already stopped production of the M-1 Tank. What then is the justification for taking the people's established forest to train? Again, the people have not been informed.

20. The recent GAO Study which evaluated the 155th Armor Brigade that had trained at Shelby found over ten major deficiencies in the 155th and two other groups. The significant thing here is that none of these deficiencies related to needing more training space, but rather related to matters of health, attitude, soldiering skills, and leadership. Now Shelby officials are touting this study either as garbage or as reenforcing their greed for more space; neither is true. These same soldiers were trained at Shelby and received double pay for each day of weekend duty, but still could not perform. They have already done enormous damage to the people's DeSoto National Forest, making thousands of acres unusable for the benefit of timber, the original purpose of this forest. Here again, the taxpayers have been severely cheated, and yet we are called upon to keep pouring funds and land into Shelby's greed.

21. As of 1989, the Army had acquired 75 individual properties within the installation area, totalling 10,000 acres. At least 46 families had been displaced, in the first 4 of the Army's 5 phases of land acquisition at Shelby. Perry Co. land had been taken by eminent domain. What is next in the military land grab?

22. Job losses at Shelby or base closure have been used as scare tactics, urging Hattiesburg to support the National Guard land grab. Little has been said about losses to the timber industry, Mississippi's largest, or of forestry jobs and those related to the timber industry. These industries have supported Hattiesburg's economy through several decades. Many of our

63:26 Comment noted.

63:27 The figure referred to (Figure 1-1) clearly labels the rectangle as "Camp Shelby Area," and it is a vicinity map, not representing anything other than orientation of a reader to the general part of Mississippi to be discussed.

63:28 See responses to comments 2:6, 21:7, and 53:4.

63:29 Comment noted. The need for and the preparedness of the National Guard are covered in Section 1.1.2.3 of the Final EIS, as well as in the response to comment 2:6. The De Soto National Forest was created under the Clarke-McNary Amendment to the Weeks law. This allowed for the purchase of lands for growing timber and watershed protection. Other than the high explosive impact area, the lands used for military activity have not sustained damage which would make them unsuitable for timber production. Please also see response to comments 3:12 and 17:5.

63:30 According to the "Real Estate Planning Report, Acquisition of Privately-owned Lands Scattered Throughout The Training Area, Camp Shelby, Mississippi, prepared by the Mobile District Corps of Engineers, dated 18 January 1983", there are five priority areas discussed involving the acquisition of approximately 9,100 acres in 12⁵ tracts of land, 6,040 acres of which were under lease. Currently the Mississippi Military Department is in the priority area 5 phase. This consists of 45 privately-owned tracts, 3,300 acres, all in Perry County. The Long Range Construction Planning Report submitted to NGB, 26 January 1993 indicates this project is programmed for FY 95; however, it has a relatively low priority for funding.

63:31 Your comment is noted. Economic benefit has never been used by the proponent as a basis for the action. Please see responses to comments 21:5 and 61:2 and misconception 25.

63:25

63:26

63:27

63:28

63:29

63:30

63:31

63:32 Comment noted. Please see the response to comment 63:31.

63:33 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 7.

63:34 Your comment is noted. Please see responses to comments 2:31 and 28:3 for additional information.

smaller towns such as Wiggins, Brooklyn, New Augusta, and Beaumont have largely survived on the timber industry--not tank training. Our economy would be greatly improved if all the land at Camp Shelby could be recovered and planted in trees.

23. The money spent by Shelby troops in Hattiesburg has been greatly exaggerated. Sales tax figures printed in the Hattiesburg American show no significant increase when Shelby is at its max training period. Again, where do these exaggerations come from? When the college students are in session at USM, then the sales tax figures show their greatest increase--not when Shelby has its largest number of troops. (Show these in final EIS.)

24. Your EIS contends that Shelby must have Alternative 1 to perform battalion-size training. Then we say, take them elsewhere. We believe that Alternative 3-8 is sufficient, and this land has already been largely damaged by previous training. Every group or person we've talked with could not favor the expansion of tank training into the Wildlife Management Area. This would be nothing short of insanity. Our personal preference would be to keep all tanks out of any national forest, and this practice should never have been allowed, considering the laws which govern these lands which belong to the people of the United States.

25. Further expansion of tank training in the DeSoto National Forest would be a crime against the intended use of this forest and against the people. We will use every method at our disposal to prevent further desecration of the DeSoto National Forest. It should be preserved to enrich our own lives and those of our children.

Sincerely,

Walter M. Denton
Walter M. Denton
LCol, Ret., U. S. Army

Virginia S. Denton
Virginia L. Denton
Ph.D., USM

Copies to:

Kenneth R. Johnson, Forest Supt.
100 W. Capitol St., Suite 1141
Jackson, MS 39269

Dale Robertson, Chief of U.S. Forest Service
U. S. Dept. of Agriculture
12th Independence SW
P.O. Box 96090
Washington, D.C. 20090-6090

Hattiesburg American
PO Box 1111
Hattiesburg, MS 39401

Sec. of Defense
Dick Cheney
Dept. of Defense
Pentagon
Washington, D.C.
20301

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Reid Derr

February 19, 1992

Thomas M. Craven
Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear sir:

I have been reading all this material on the proposed use of DeSoto National Forest land for Camp Shelby's tank training. I think the National Guard ought to be allowed to train in an expanded area. Our military needs to train even in peacetime and it needs the expanded area in South Mississippi to do it.

64:1

64:2

Thank you for your consideration of my opinion.

Sincerely,



Reid S. Derr
Hattiesburg, Mississippi

64:1 Comment noted. Please see misconception 5.

64:2 Comment noted.



Nugent United Methodist Church

"Let us be regarded as servants of Christ."

January 8, 1992

U. S. Senator Trent Lott
487 Russell Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Lott,

I am writing to express my concern with the proposed expansion of the Camp Shelby training facilities. I have attended the public forums sponsored by the Army and reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement prepared by the Corps of Engineers. I am of the opinion that any activity - military, commercial or otherwise - that requires cutting timber, road building or other developmental work is not acceptable. We in Mississippi have a wonderful asset in the Desoto National Forest, and we should in no way damage that resource with developmental work. Therefore, I am adamantly opposed to any expansion or activity at Camp Shelby into the National Forest. I am aware of the possibilities for economic development but believe that we would be selling our birthright for a bowl of porridge.

I also feel compelled to register my concern with our current Federal budget deficit. It almost goes without saying that we, as a nation, are going to be swallowed by debt if some decisive action is not taken. I perceive a great loss of confidence in the ability of the Federal government to effectively manage the affairs of the nation. I trust that you will use your influence in Washington to address these concerns.

Sincerely,

Rod Dickson-Rishel

RDR:bp

Church Address: 13183 John Clark Rd., Gulfport, MS 39503
Telephone: Church and Pastor's Study / 832-6145

Church Location: John Clark Rd. and Old Hwy. 49 in Nugent, Mississippi

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Rod Dickson-Rishel

65:1 Comment noted.

65:2 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 5.

65:3 Comment noted. Refer to Misconception 25.

65:1

65:2

65:3

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

<p>PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FIRMLY</p> <p>Name: <u>Bob Dickson-Richel</u></p> <p>Address: <u>13083 AUGUST RD</u></p> <p><u>Gulfport MS 39503</u></p> <p>City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____</p>		<p>Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Gulfport, MS January 8, 1992</p>
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>I am opposed to the expansion of the training & Special Use Permit requested by the National Guard in all areas. The loss of forest is dramatic and forest is of considerable value for wildlife and recreation.</p>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>than tank corridors and my grass. I have a deep distrust of the military hierarchy in general that this will simply be a step towards loss of more forest to military use.</p>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>I question the value of the type training proposed in general. Finally we in Mississippi have not recognized National Forest lands for all our citizens to enjoy.</p>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>and should not lose these to the questionable enterprise of National Guard training.</p>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	

65:7 Comment noted. Please see Section 3.3.2.3.1 and general misconception statements 9 and 22.

65:6 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 3:12 and 17:5 and general misconception statement 22.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FIRMLY	
Name: <u>Red Dickman</u>	Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings
Address: <u>13083 August Rd</u>	State: <u>MS</u> Zip: <u>39085</u>
City: <u>Gulfport</u>	City: <u>MS</u>
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA: <u>Economics</u>
A new specific plan of positive economic impact beyond the initial timber sale should be developed. The sale of timber will have only a nominal benefit to the community when compared to loss of the forest lands. the I firmly	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
believe that the intrinsic value of 13000 acres of forest preserved there is far greater than than the benefit that may be derived from the sale of the same timber and the loss of that woodshed for	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
The for seeable future.	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
The training plan in general is	
the wrapping of forest blocks of forest for blocks at 9000 and I believe that the forest, left undisturbed, will provide a far greater natural resource	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
in the long term than a tracked vehicle training area	

65:5 Comment noted. The training proposed is a compromise, in that the constraints you mention do exist. The experiences which the units lack are because much of present training is not realistic enough, which is why the redesigned areas were proposed. See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:310.

65:8 Comment noted. Please see Sections 3.3.3.4 and 3.5.11 of the Final EIS and response to comment 21:8.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FIRMLY

Name: <u>Bob Dickson, Rishel</u> Address: <u>13083 August Rd</u> City: <u>Gulfport, MS</u> State: <u>MS</u> Zip: <u>39503</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Gulfport, MS January 8, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
I am not a military technician nor expert but it seems to me that training done in the proposed fashion will be of little value to the military personnel even in the training area they will be restricted in the		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
And they can use land will be driving over the Army ground survey a better more realistic model could be developed that or training limited simply learning to operate the equipment.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
There is no question that tank training in the proposed area will greatly diminish the recreational value of the national forest. Keeping the Army while trying to enjoy the woods will definitely compromise		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
the quality of the outdoor experience. I can in no way see how national forest recreational use and military training can be compatible		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	

65:5

65:8

FRANK DIX
1371 1300 W. EL BONITO DRIVE
GULF HILLS-OCEAN SPRINGS, MISSISSIPPI 39564

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Frank Dix

- 66:1 Your comment is noted. See general misconception statement 23.
- 66:2 See response to comment 2:6.
- 66:3 See response to comments 10:5 and 14:46.
- 66:4 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 1:4 and 1:33 and general misconception statement 7.

Private Mail U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-
Attention: Thane M. Cramer
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, Ala. 36628-0001

66:1 As a long time resident of Mississippi I want to say as to my strong opposition to the National Bureau allocate No. 1 priority to do with the proposed take over of 75% of the Long River Wildlife Management Area to be added for flood manure. It certainly will not the lack of land in Mississippi the three Mississippi brigade from down in the South.
66:2 To clear cut land cause erosion - already a serious problem in much of the United States. The attempt to put represent a compromise which I am opposed to - certainly need acceptable that No. 1 allocate.
66:3 Certainly a majority of the citizens of Mississippi agree with my position.
66:4

Yours truly
Frank Dix.

66:5 Comment noted. Section 3.1.1.3 of the Final EIS notes that 100% of the repair plan has been completed in recent years. See response to comments 7:4 and 7:16.

66:6 Comment noted. See responses to comment 2:6 and misconception 8.

66:7 Comment noted. See response to comment 2:31 and general misconception statement 16.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FINELY

Name: <u>Frank Dix</u>	Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings
Address: <u>13911 E. Prairie 14:57</u>	Gulfport, MS
City: <u>Osborn Spring MS 39564</u>	January 8, 1992
State: _____	
Zip: _____	

COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
WHY SELECT FOR THIS REVIEW IF NOT EXPANDED TRAINING, A PRODUCTIVE AREA AS DESIGNATED FOREST WHEN THE US HAS MANY SQUARE MILES OF DESERT AND/OR UNPRODUCTIVE LAND?	

66:7

COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
WHY EXPAND TRAINING AT A TIME OF GREATLY DECREASED INTERNATIONAL TENSIONS?	

66:6

COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
IF DAMAGE CAN BE MITIGATED WHY HAS PERMIT PROCESS APPEAL NOT BEEN INITIATED?	

66:5

COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:

COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Edward Donovan

Edward F. Donovan
Attorney at Law

134 Rue Magnolia, P.O. Box 87
Biloxi, Mississippi 39533

Telephone (601) 374-8004
March 5, 1992

Mobile District U. S. Army Corps
of Engineers CESAM-PD-EI
ATTENTION: Thomas M. Craven
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Re: National Guard Efforts to Invade
Leaf River Wildlife Management Area

Dear Mr. Craven:

For several years during the mid-1960s, I spent almost every day of deer season that I was not obliged to be in school in the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area. Our camp did not use dogs but rather young eager drovers filled with the contagion of the hunt. We were taught to be respectful of the woods we traversed. In those many years, I did not bag a single deer, yet I would not trade the memory of those days in the woods for all the tea in China. My knowledge about myself and my place in this world was certainly enhanced by the many hours of foot travel in that vast area we called the management area.

I did not then understand nor do I likely now appreciate how much work must go into preserving this area of our state for the enjoyment of all who choose to see it. I am now 25 and more years away from the experiences I had in the Leaf River Management Area. My son is just now getting to the age where he needs to begin his awareness of the woods. What one can learn in unspoiled woodlands will not survive tank maneuvers.

I understand the alternative plan proposed by the National Guard would clear-cut several acres of woodlands. My travels in this country have not been extensive, but I have seen places without trees for as far as I could see. Ready-made treeless landscapes. Why must we destroy something so beautiful in order to create something we already have in abundance?

I hope that those making the decision in this case will select wisely and fairly. I trust that they will indulge a presumption in favor of the preservation of the Leaf River Management Area, and that they not surrender their responsibility to the public trust absent compelling evidence that the use proposed by the National Guard is truly critical.

Very truly yours,

EFD/kbd
CC: Honorable Gene Taylor

EDWARD F. DONOVAN

67:1 Comment noted. Please also see general misconception statements 10 and 11.
67:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:31 and general misconception statements 9 and 16.
67:3 Comment noted.

67:1

67:2

67:3

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Jim Dossett

68:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 5.

68:2 Please see response to comment 21:5 and general misconceptions 3 and 25.

68:3 Please see response to comment 21:5 and general misconception statement 9.

68:4 Comment noted. Please see the response to comment 32:2.

68:1

I am a citizen against the expansion of Camp Shelby. There are many reasons I am against it. The main reason is because it would take away some jobs for those in this area who really need them. The timber brings in a lot of revenue per year not only for those in the timber industry but also for the school system & etc. This income will continue to come in indefinitely as long as the land stays as is, but if it is turned over to Camp Shelby this source of revenue will end forever on this land.

68:2

68:3

So it doesn't take a genius to figure out that the people of this area will lose big if this deal goes through. Also it will cause the morals of the community to decay even further. More soldiers for more days per year will mean more drunks in the bars and more drunk drivers on the road plus an increase in the number of prostitutes who already service the soldiers of Camp Shelby. We don't need this.

68:4

Yours Truly,
Jim Dossett

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
R.D. Eastman

70:1 See response to comment 62:1.

70:1

12/5/91 x

Dear Sir, 09 DEC RECD

Please begin the
60 day public comment per-
iod on the Environmental Impact
Statement on Jan. 1 rather
than 11/29. December is
a bad month for concerns
other than family and
Christmas.

I hope you will consider
this request.

Thank you

R.D. Eastman

R.D. EASTMAN
305 Hillendale Drive
Hattiesburg,

MS 39402

71:1 Comment noted.

71:2 Comment noted. Refer to Sections 2.4.5, 3.1.2.5, 3.2.1, 3.3.2.5, 3.5.6, and 4.1.3.1.1 pertaining to TE&S species and the measures taken to protect them.

71:3 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 9.

71:1

71:2

71:3

Dear Mr. Brewer:

Yhis letter is to let you know that I am violently opposed to the expanded tank training in the hog wildlife management area.

We must protect all endangered species of plant and wild life. There are so many of us that love the area for its

natural beauty and abundant wildlife. To spoil all this would be destroying this natural heritage for generations to come.

As a concerned citizen I beg you to give this matter your consideration.

Sincerely,
Carmen M. Engram

20533 Mennomette Rd
Gulport, MS. 39503

25 Feb/92

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Beverly Evans

72:1 The Forest Service is continually working to improve the recreation experience enjoyed by forest visitors. Additional facilities in some stage of planning are horse and ATV trails. The Black Creek Scenic River is the focal point of most recreation visits not associated with hunting. To increase enjoyment of this area the Forest Service has formed a partnership with the using public in determining management recommendations for the area. See additional discussion in Section 3.1.3.4 for additional information.

72:2 See response to comment 35:27.

72:3 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:31 and misconception 16.

Thomas M. Craven
Corps. of Engineers
P.O. Box 2280
Mobile, Ala. 36628-0001

72:1

I have been to Desoto National Forest and I believe work should be done to improve not discourage recreation. With all that has been said about destroying the rain forest in South America we should be concerned about local forests and their effect on the ecosystem. I am sure there is some useless, wasted, barren land that could be used for tank activity; then develop the land into something useful. There must be a landfill past it's time that could be used and then developed into Mount Trashmore II or something of that nature.

72:2

72:3

Sincerely,

Beverly E. Evans
421 Inverness Circle
Ocean Springs, Ms. 39564

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Richard Felder

RICHARD FELDER
308 2ND AVE.
HATTIESBURG MS 3940

THOMAS M. CRAVEN
CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

73:1 Comment noted. See misconceptions 12 and 22.

73:2 See response to comment 21:2.

73:3 See response to comment 21:3.

73:4 See response to comment 21:5.

73:5 See response to comment 21:4.

73:6 See response to comment 2:31.

73:7 This is covered in Sections 1.1.2.1 and 1.1.2.3 of the Final EIS. Please also see responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31.

Dear Sir:

Please consider my plea as a basis for determining the outcome of the Camp Shelby land-swap ordeal. I wish to save the land primarily for public recreational use for our generation and generations to come.

Reasons for saving this land from being handed over for military uses also include the following:

- 1) the loss of managed timber revenues from massive clear-cutting the forest would be an unjustified setback.
- 2) the damage to fragile eco-systems would be devastating to many species of plants and animals.
- 3) the loss of forestry and forest-related jobs would be a great sacrifice for our economy.
- 4) the noise pollution from tank maneuvers would be distracting and very disturbing to those in the surrounding Leaf River area.
- 5) there are other training areas for the National Guard troops and other military personnel which can suffice there needs
- 6) the land Camp Shelby uses now has been sufficient during the past and should well be sufficient for the future.

7) the loss of recreational facilities to visitors could destroy chances of drawing outsiders to our beautiful state.

73:8

All these things and more should weigh on your mind when deciding the future of our South Mississippi area, which is most importantly used for health and satisfaction for our state.

Sincerely,

Richard E. Jellison

74:1 Comment noted.

74:2 Changes in the environment are associated with all alternatives, but are not believed to represent irreplaceable elements. Please also see response to comments 3:12 and 17:5, and misconceptions 9, 10, and 11.


74:3 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 2:31 and misconception 16.

1:42

74:2

74:3

74:3



75:1 Comment noted.

75:2 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 21:3 and 21:6.

75:3 See response to comments 21:2 and 21:5.

SERVICES AND ASSOCIATES

P. O. Box 13603
Jackson, Mississippi 39236-3603
(601) 986-4639

GLORIA FISHER, PH.D.
Industrial/Organizational Psychology

Dear Mr. Caven,

I am opposed to expanding tank training
in De So to National Forest. My reasons for

this opposition are:

- Environmental damage which would negatively impact ~~the~~ plants, animals, and humans;
- Loss of forest and loss of revenue ~~from~~ for
forest related jobs.

Sincerely,
Gloria Fisher

FLOYD AND FLOYD

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
1421 24TH AVENUE
GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI 39501

JASON H. FLOYD
EVELYN FLOYD

POST OFFICE BOX 1107
TELEPHONE (601) 863-0522

March 3, 1992

U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
CESAN-PD-EI
Mobile District
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile AL 36628-0001

Attention Thomas M. Craven

Gentlemen:

We have just been advised of the environmental impact statement on the proposed Camp Shelby land expansion for tank and track vehicle maneuvers into additional areas of the Desoto National Forest, including the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area. Although we oppose as being unwise the use of any additional acreage into the LRWMA for tank maneuvers if it is decided that additional acreage will be used for this purpose, we think that alternative 3B represents a reasonable compromise which will allow the National Guard adequate training space, but will keep tanks out of the LRWMA. Alternative #1 will allow the Guard to seriously harm prime natural areas as a result of tank training, while abandoning lands already used for that purpose. The difference in the two alternatives is only 2,220 acres.

If additional acreage is allotted for tank training, we urge that alternative 3A be adopted rather than alternative #1.

Very truly yours,

Jason & Evelyn Floyd
Jason & Evelyn Floyd

JHF,EF/dahs

cc: Col. Pete Denton
Citizens Against the Land Steal
P.O. Box 219
Brooklyn MS 39425

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Jason and Evelyn Floyd

76:1 See general misconception statement 7 and 14.

76:2 All lands in question have been used for training purposes, and areas returned to forest management will be replanted. No abandonment is suggested. Please also see general misconception statement 7.

76:3 Comment noted. The many smaller elements of which this area is composed cannot meet full requirements for training at the battalion task force level.

76:1

76:2

76:3

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Jean Todd Freeman

424 South 23rd Avenue
Hattiesburg, MS 39401

February 27, 1992

Mr. Tom Craven
Mobile District, Corps of Engineers
CESAM-PD-EI
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628

Dear Mr. Craven:

I would like to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement concerning the Military Training Use of National Forest Lands, Camp Shelby, MS.

As a sixth-generation Mississippian and a long-time resident of Forrest County, I am concerned about the wise use and responsible stewardship of our state's natural resources. As a member of the National Audubon Society, Pine Woods Chapter, I am committed to the preservation of habitat for native plants and wildlife, especially for those species considered endangered, threatened, or sensitive. Because the Draft EIS has failed to persuade me that no serious environmental damage will result from expanded tank training in the DeSoto National Forest, I am opposed to any and all such expansion.

Pine Woods Audubon has already submitted to you a list of 22 questions concerning the Draft EIS, which we would like to have addressed in the Final EIS. I endorse all these questions, but would like to focus here on one specific problem: the unexplained disappearance of an entire red-cockaded woodpecker colony from Forest Compartment 103 in January or February 1990.

These RCWs were apparently the last representatives of the endangered species to be seen on land used by Camp Shelby, although the area supported a number of active colonies in the past. As a volunteer monitor with the US Forest Service, I visited this particular colony several times during the summer and fall of 1989, and last saw two of the birds in January of 1990. At that time the colony appeared to be in good shape; the woodpeckers were actively foraging and calling back and forth near the primary nesting tree. On my next attempt to visit the colony I was unable to reach the site because so much fresh gravel had been dumped on the road that I feared for my tires. I later learned from Mike Hurst, USFS, Black Creek Division, that all the RCWs had disappeared soon thereafter.

It seems to me that the disappearance of the last remaining representatives of an endangered species within one's care is, or should be, a fairly noteworthy event. Yet nowhere in the DEIS is this event fully discussed. Appendix N [N-2] states: "The most recent record of red-cockaded woodpeckers using lands within the bounded area in Figure 1 was in January-February 1990; from February through September 1990, no red-cockaded woodpeckers have been reported..." but makes

77:1 Comment noted.

77:2 The history of the colony in Compartment 103 and additional information on Forest Service RCW management efforts may be found in the responses to comments 14:22 and 14:24.

77:1

77:2

77-2

no attempt to explain the disappearance and does not even identify the colony as being located in compartment 103. Indeed, the EIS clearly implies that the woodpeckers most recently recorded were located not in compartment 103 but in compartment 229, which is characterized as "recently used" [N-3] and singled out as a training ground for survey personnel. Compartment 103, in contrast, is cursorily dismissed with "no woodpecker signs" [N-18] and absolutely no mention that it had contained a healthy and flourishing active colony only months before.

77-3

Is this confusion or obfuscation? Why use as an example for a survey team a colony abandoned some time ago (229) in preference to a colony active only a few months ago (103)? A few days ago I talked by telephone with Dr. Jerome Jackson, the RCW expert who assisted with the survey, and he could not recall ever having been taken to the colony site in Compartment 103. Why not? It would seem that Camp Shelby personnel would have eagerly sought Dr. Jackson's opinion as to why this colony was abandoned. One would almost think that a deliberate attempt was being made to conceal or at the very least to downplay the importance of Colony 103.

77-2

77-4

In fact, was any effort at all made to determine why the RCWs left this colony and where they might have relocated? If not, why not?

77-5

At the January 9 public meeting sponsored by Camp Shelby and held in Hattiesburg I attempted to find out the answers to some of those questions. When I asked Dr. Harold E. Balbach, he just laughed and said (in more or less these words) "Well, since we don't have any idea why the birds are there in the first place, we certainly don't know why they decide to leave." This was hardly the sort of answer I expected from an environmental biologist, who surely must know that the RCWs were in Forest Compartment 103 because it provided one of the last remaining acceptable habitats in the area for birds with the peculiar requirements of their species. Why they abandoned a colony they had occupied for many years is a question I should think Dr. Balbach would at least take seriously.

77-5

I hope the final EIS will include a full and complete discussion of the disappearance of the RCWs from Compartment 103, with details of any investigation that took place regarding this matter, and the results thereof.

77-5

I also suggest that before any reconfiguration action takes place on DeSoto National Forest lands, Dr. Jerome Jackson be engaged as a consultant to minimize damage to potential RCW habitat in the affected area.

Sincerely yours,

Jean T. Freeman

Jean Todd Freeman

77:3 Compartment 229 was used as the survey example because there are multiple trees which are readily accessible and had been active within a year of when the colony in Compartment 103 had been. It was Professor Jackson's decision, and he was familiar with the habitat and colonies in both compartments. Also see response to comment 14:24.

77:4 The history of the colony in Compartment 103 and additional information on Forest Service RCW management efforts may be found in the responses to comments 14:22 and 14:24.

77:5 The general decline of the red-cockaded woodpecker in all parts of the De Soto National Forest is examined in Section 2.4.5.1.1 of the Final EIS. No differences in survival are seen in the areas that are not used for military training, especially where colonies are small and relatively distant from other populations. The management of listed species on National Forest lands remains the responsibility of the Forest Service.

77:6 The explanation of Table 4-1 states, in part, "If the present status is set at 0 on the above scale, the environmental effects anticipated (long and short term), are then displayed as no change or some positive or negative deviation from the present status. Thus, there is no inconsistency between the text at ES-9, 3-133, and Table 4-1. Proponents have never suggested a major benefit to local or regional economics will result from selection of Alternative 1. The only "benefit" present may be the avoidance a loss of employment which would result from selection of Alternative 6. Please refer to Sections 3.3.3.2 and 3.3.4.1 of the FEIS and misconception 25.

77-6

ECONOMY

According to the draft EIS, "the regional economy/employment will not be affected by alternatives 1 through 4, long or short term, however, alternatives 5 and 6 will have a negative effect, both long and short term." [ES-9]

Elsewhere [3-133] it is stated that "Alternatives 1,2,3-A and 3-B are expected to have a small positive effect on the economy."

In Table 4-1, alternatives 1,2,3-A, 3-B, 4, and 5 are shown to have zero ["0"] effect on the economy, short-term.

Which is it -- no effect, small positive effect, or zero effect? Could you be more specific as to actual numbers of jobs that will be gained or lost with each alternative, and estimate the monetary gain or loss to the local economy in each case? We feel the draft EIS should have addressed this issue in depth, in fairness to the many Hattiesburg residents who are stating publically that the reconfigured training use at Camp Shelby will be of enormous economic benefit to the local economy. If they are mistaken in this belief, they should be so advised.

Jean T Freeman *Pine Woods Auditor*
424 South 23rd Ave.
Hattiesburg, MS 39401

EDGE and BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

"Bewick's wren occurs on Camp Shelby only as a migrant and winter resident." (2-23)

This statement is typical of the cavalier and careless attitude toward wildlife that makes people wonder if Camp Shelby is serious about its stewardship of the DeSoto National Forest. Is a winter resident less important than a summer resident? If migrants have no suitable habitat for resting and foraging on their long trips to the nesting grounds, will they ever survive to breed and fledge young?

This carelessness pervades the many references to "tree islands" as desirable alternatives to clearcutting and other more radical forest modification. Although on 3-81 the EIS does cite Severinghaus on reduction in avian biomass, the general impression created throughout the EIS is that "edge" is good.

Though edge is indeed good for blackbirds, starlings, grackles, jays, and cowbirds (and for predators like raccoons) it is not at all desirable for Swainson's, wormeating, cerulean, blackburnian, prothonotary, hooded, and Kentucky warblers, along with yellow-throated vireos, tanagers, Acadian flycatchers, fox and Lincoln's sparrows, and numerous other species.

There's already far and away too much edge in the De Soto National Forest and throughout the United States. If we have to have more of it, at least let's not pretend it's desirable.

Jean T Freeman *psw wws Autul*
424 South 23rd Avnue
Hattiesburg, MS 39401

77:7 The amount of new edge being created by alternative and facility, and those species expected to gain or lose, has been estimated and included in the Section 3.3.2.6 of the Final EIS. In addition, the importance of the winter residents to biodiversity has also been addressed. See also the response to comment 1:9, 1:11, and 1:12, regarding the function of forested islands as treated in the Draft EIS.

RCW Colonies

What happened to the RCW colony in Forest Compartment 103?

According to Appendix N, sometime after February 1990 the last red-cockaded woodpeckers remaining on lands used by Camp Shelby disappeared from their colony in forest compartment 103 just below the firing range. I had seen the birds myself in January 1990 and several times in the fall of 1989, and they appeared to be in no danger of deserting or being driven from the colony despite the proximity of the colony to the road and the firing range. Nevertheless, they disappeared.

In the past, Camp Shelby according to its own count had fifteen (probably more) RCW colonies in its stewardship. Anyone can see, by marking the map to show where these colonies historically existed, that the large firing range was placed smack dab in the middle of some 12 colonies; and that in all likelihood a number of other colonies were obliterated by clearing for the range. Certainly no one would blame Camp Shelby for this gigantic environmental disaster because the blunder was made before anyone recognized the fragility of the RCW. Nevertheless, the result was apparently the dispersal or death of a number of RCWs.

There seems less excuse, however, for the loss of Colony 103, and I think several questions are in order:

When was the disappearance of this colony first noticed? What was done about it? Presumably the Forest Service reported the absence of the birds. Did Camp Shelby personnel cooperate fully with the FS in this matter? Was an immediate search of the area initiated to see if the missing birds could be located? Was a study made to determine what caused the birds to leave? Were all Camp Shelby personnel immediately notified and instructed to keep an eye out for the birds or for possible new cavity starts throughout the area?

If I were in charge of a military facility that was trying to persuade the USFS, the USFWS, and the public that it needed and deserved more land to train on, and that it would be a good steward of that land, and if I happened to have three members of an endangered species within my care, I believe I would be damned sure that nothing happened to those three little birds. And if something did happen to them, I believe I would do my utmost to find out why they disappeared so that I could be sure it wouldn't happen again.

That the Draft EIS fails to address this serious lapse in your stewardship of the land seems to me an indication of unbecoming arrogance, sheer sloppiness, or both.

Jean T Freeman
424 South 23rd Avenue
Hattiesburg, MS 39401

9/12/90 J. Freeman

RCW Colonies

"Camp Shelby has and will continue to follow all guidelines provided by the US Fish & Wildlife...and the Forest Service... in regards to T & E species." [EIS 3.3.1]

The interpretation of these guidelines is sometimes unclear in the EIS. The Forest Service interim policy standards for RCW management include not cutting within 3/4 mile of RCW colonies; and the Draft EIS states [3-132] "with the preferred alternative a substantial quantity of timber will be removed (outside the 3/4 mile buffer around RCW colony sites) in some areas." Yet Figures 3-13 and 3-16 clearly show proposed cutting within the 3/4 mile limit, while Figures 3-11 and 3-15 show corridors which appear to cut directly through RCW and other T & E habitat.

Elsewhere in the EIS document (e.g. 3-95) it is stated that military activity is restricted within 200 feet of a RCW colony or gopher tortoise sites. Is the 3/4 mile limit observed only in regard to tree removal, with tank maneuvers OK up to 200 feet? See also the discrepancy between the 200-foot buffer zone observed for gopher tortoise sites and the 984 feet recommended by FWS (Appendix L-1-5).

Jean T Freeman
424 South 23rd Ave.
Hattiesburg, MS 39401

PWE woods daniel

77:9 Many of the corridors are placed on existing roadways, which are already cleared. The interim guidelines for the RCW restrict the amount and type of timber removal within 3/4 mile of a colony, they do not exclude all timber removal. Also, the corridor locations are only conceptual in nature, and in most cases will not be placed exactly as shown, and may be re-routed if required. A site-specific analysis will be conducted to determine the exact path, with primary consideration given to guidelines pertaining to T&E species.

77:10 You are correct, the restriction on military activities applies to the 200 ft buffer and not the 3/4 mile radius which restricts timber removal. In regards to the gopher tortoise, the 984 foot (300 meter) buffer recommended by the contractor for gopher tortoise colonies was quoted in the 1989 biological opinion. The guidelines actually contained in that biological opinion by the USFWS require a 200 foot buffer around colonies. The more recent (September, 1992 and October, 1993) biological opinions also include recommendations that a 200 foot buffer be observed.

77-9

77-10

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Lena Fuller

78:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 3:12 and 17:5.

78:2 See responses to comments 2:6 and misconceptions 8 and 9.

78:3 Comment noted. Military training is an authorized activity under the Master Agreement between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense (see Appendix A).

24 Feb 1992
Bullock, MS

Mr Thomas M. Croan
Crops of Engineers

Sir:

I get very angry about the mutilation of our forest as proposed by the Army National Guard tank detach.

In this day and age, when the President is closing bases, Drafts V etc, wants and is reducing military personnel, why does the National Guard need to destroy more of our forest land? We not they having to reduce personnel, if not, why not?

And how much of that land would be come "play ground" for the Guard personnel?

78:1

78:2

78:3

(2)

The camping, hunting etc
areas should be engaged
by all citizens - their help
with oxygen which energy
we need.

Let's eliminate the "Land
Steal"! Where are the voices
that should be heard from both
State and Federal entities?
Where are the consciences
of these guardians of our
resources, including our
Indians, Physicians?

So let the Guard have
this National Forest we have
timber we remove from massive
Clear-Cutting; damage to
fragile ecosystems which
include protected animals
and plants; loss of biodiversity
and forest related jobs; the
quality of life especially
for people who live near
this proposed land training;

78:4 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:8.

78:5 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 14:47.

78:6 Please see misconceptions 12 and 23.

78:7 Comment noted.

78:8 See response to comment 21:2.

78:9 See response to comment 21:3.

78:10 See response to comment 21:5.

78:11 See response to comment 21:6.

(3)

78:12 See response to comment 21:7.

78:13 See response to comment 2:6.

78:14 See response to comment 21:8.

78:15 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 3:12 and 17:5 and misconception 9.

Again I point out reduction
in military and halted
production of m-1 tank;
no established mission or
need; and a gain I point
out loss of recreational
facilities to visitors across
the Country as well as
the citizens of Mississippi.

I feel it is a sin as
crime to destroy our national
forests as well as "wet
lands and/or rain
forest wherever they be!

Lena M. Tucker
1395 Father Ryan
Biloxi, MS, 39530

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Ruby Fulton

5737 Clinton Boulevard
Jackson, Mississippi 39209
February 24, 1992

Thomas M. Craven
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Mobile, Alabama

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am writing because of my concern in regard to the De Soto National Forest, and the current plan to convert it into a base for tank training.

Having lived through several wars from World War II on, I am aware and fully supportive of our need for a trained military. But I am not at all certain that destroying the De Soto Forest is the proper way to obtain it, especially in view of the fact that our country holds various open areas usable for such a base, which would not entail tree destruction.

The loss of timber revenues provided by managed cutting, the loss of forest related jobs, the loss of recreational facilities together with the recent reduction in our armed forces and the halting of production on the M-1 tank, make the tank-training base unwise in my opinion.

Please consider these ideas, and reject the conversion plan. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Ruby Fulton

79:1 See responses to comments 2:31, 3:12, and 17:5 and misconception 9.

79:2 Comment noted. Please also see responses to comments 21:2, 21:5, 21:8, and 21:7.

79:1

79:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Mary Gandy

19 Marlin Circle
Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39402
February 15, 1992

Mr. Thomas M. Craven
Corps of Engineers, Mobile District
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36624-0001

Dear Mr. Craven,

I am writing to protect in the strongest possible terms the DeSoto National Forest land acquisition proposed for the Mississippi National Guard. Far too much forest land has already been destroyed in this state as in others in the United States, as a study of American history will reveal. In view of the cessation of the so-called Cold War I fail to see the necessity for any more land to be devoted to tank training, or any other kind of military training for that matter. Surely there is enough land already available for this purpose.

When I first came to live in the United States, in 1946, I was most impressed by the beautiful trees, either within the national forests or outside. My own country, England, is very beautiful, it is true, but it, along with the other countries of the British Isles, has lost, permanently, much of its forest-land due to overcutting through the centuries. It would be a shame and a disgrace if America, the Beautiful, went the same way.

I realize many people are concerned for their jobs, but it should be realized that jobs may be subject to budget cuts, anyway, and if the land acquisition goes through the damage will have been done, and the forest land, with its dependent creatures will be lost forever. Short-sighted interests should not be allowed to prevail over what is really a long-term problem.

Again, I urge you to do whatever is necessary to see that this land acquisition does not take place, and the beautiful DeSoto National Forest not be further despoiled.

Sincerely yours,

Mary H. Gandy

Mary H. Gandy
(Mrs. J. H. Gandy, Jr.)

80:1 See general misconception statement 12.

80:2 Comment noted.

80:3 See response to comment 2:6. See misconception 8.

80:4 See response to comment 2:31.

80:5 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 9 and 12.

80:6 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 12.

80:1

80:2

80:3

80:4

80:5

80:6

Feb 20, 1992

CofE

Mr Thomas M Craven

Re: Desoto National Forest

Dear Mr Craven,

I am writing you to object to the expansion of the tank training in the Desoto Forest.

First and foremost, it is wrong to continue to destroy trees & forests (either here or anywhere) for many reasons - recreational, wildlife, beauty,

Second, I dispute that there is any reason to expand military training, especially in today's world. Even if there were such an increased need, is the training somewhere the impact would be less damaging to the world.

Third, the impact on the people who live in and around the affected area will be detrimental.

Summary, there are many reasons against and no good reason for the proposal.

Yours C. Gannon. 1344 Woodshell Dr. Jackson, Ms 39212

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
C. Gannon

81:1 Comment noted.

81:2 See responses to comments 3:12, 17:5, 21:8, 21:6.

81:3 See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31 and misconception 8.

81:4 See response to comment 21:6.

81:5 Comment noted.

81:1

81:2

81:3

81:4

81:5

February 24, 1972

Louise & Dan Gardner
190 Bluebird Lane
Brandon, MS 39042

Mr. Thomas M. Craven
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

We as citizens of the State of Mississippi would like to express our opposition to expanded tank training by the National Guard in the DeSoto National Forest, especially the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area. We are outraged that there is even the possibility of the people's land being used (and devastated) in such a way, especially during a time of peace when there is no established mission or need.

Other reasons for our opposition include:

- 1- Damage to fragile ecosystems which involve protected animals + plants, including the gopher tortoise, which is already an endangered species.
- 2- Loss of trees from our public lands
- 3- Loss of recreational facilities to us the PEOPLE

82:1

82:2

82:3

82:4

82:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Louise and Dan Gardner

82:1 Comment noted.

82:2 See responses to comments 2:6, 3:12, and 17:5.

82:3 See response to comment 21:3.

82:4 The loss of trees is unavoidable in the implementation of this type project. The trees will be utilized for various wood products and represent a monetary return to the federal treasury. The trees would eventually have been harvested as part of normal National Forest management. When the national need for this type training area is no longer present, the lands will be replanted and eventually look similar to today's forest. Please also see response to comment 21:5.

82:5 See response to comment 21:8.

Page 2
Thomas M. Craven
February 24, 1992

82:6 See response to comments 21:4 and 21:6.

82:7 See response to comment 21:7.

82:8 See general misconception statement 7.

4- Noise pollution and diminished quality of life
for people living near the area
5- The recent reduction in the military +
halted production on the M-1 tank.

82:6

82:7

While we prefer that no additional land
be slated for clear-cutting for tank training,
Alternative 3B represents a compromise which
would allow the National Guard adequate training
space, but will keep tanks out of the LWRMA.
It is definitely preferable to Alternative #1.

82:8

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,
Forise B. Gardner
Dan G. Gardner Jr

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Anne Garrott

February 27, 1992

83:1 Comment noted.

83:2 Comment noted. Please see Sections 1.1.2.1 and 1.1.2.3 of the Final EIS and response to comment 2:6.

83:3 See the discussion on cumulative effects in Section 3.5 of the Final EIS, and response to comments 3:12 and 17:5. Please also see general misconception statement 9.

83:4 Comment noted.

83:5 Comment noted. When bases are closed, they are not available for National Guard use. Please also see response to comment 2:31.

Dear Mr. Craven

I am absolutely opposed to any expanded military & tank training in the Osoto National Forest. I am opposed to any clear cutting of trees in this area or any area where absolute necessity has not been established. This would endanger all wildlife & plants in this area and clearly do irrevocable harm to the environment.

Please do not let this happen!

P.S. Take this as a call for needed military training to bases that have been closed by the military.

With sincere concern for our environment,

Anne Mangt
1807 Gay Street
Ocean Springs, MS 39564
601-875-9550

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Larry Gates

Rt. 3 Box 275C5
Purvis, MS 39475
February 27, 1992

Mr. Thomas M. Craven
Mobile District
Corps of Engineers
Mobile, AL 36626-0001

Dear Mr. Thomas:

This is a response to the Camp Shelby Draft Environmental Impact Statement:

The EIS greatly underestimates the impact of noise pollution. Published studies exist about the impact of noise on wildlife. The impact is very real and very grave. Please cite studies about wild turkeys and other wildlife. Please also cite studies about the impact of noise pollution on human beings.

Not enough on-sight work was done. Computer simulations based on partially suspect data from other parts of the country are not acceptable.

A quick search by airplane for red-cockaded woodpeckers is not sufficient.

No justification is given for the need for battalion tank training for National Guardsmen. Is this critical to the national defense? Who says so? What justifications do they give? What do the Secretary of Defense, the President, Congress and the Pentagon say? Please do not sidestep this issue. Show us federal documents demonstrating that this training with these men at this site is essential.

It was stated that Alternative 6 would be harmful to the environment, because of the erosion that would occur. This is a ridiculous statement.

Your conclusions don't match your data. There is plenty in the EIS as it now stands to indicate that military bases and wilderness don't mix.

You need to cite data showing that islands of trees are as beneficial to wildlife as extensive and uninterrupted stands. If you can't find the data you should say that you are just guessing about this. I think you are guessing wrong.

Please refrain from saying that clearing creates new wildlife habitat. This can be used to justify just about anything. Devastated areas almost always create habitat for a few species that weren't around before. So what?

Please mention the moral outrage of scores of citizens and also

84:1 Comment noted. Coverage of this topic in Sections 3.1.5 and 3.3.5 of the Final EIS has been expanded.

84:2 Extensive on-site studies have been performed. The computer study quoted was prepared for this EIS by an agency based in Maryland, all data used are from actual Camp Shelby weapons use.

84:3 See response to comment 51:16.

84:4 See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31.

84:5 Comment noted.

84:6 Comment noted. See misconceptions 15 and 22.

84:7 Please see responses to comments 1:9, 1:11, 1:12 and 1:30.

84:8 Comment noted. Considerable additional coverage has been given to habitat change and biodiversity in the Final EIS (Sections 2.4.7 and 3.1.2.6).

84:1

84:2

84:3

84:4

84:5

84:6

84:7

84:8

84:9

editorials in the CLARION LEDGER and THE SUN HERALD (the state's two best and most widely read newspapers.) The moral environment exist too. It's just as real as the economic environment. It is just as pertinent as computer simulations done in other states.

Please address the issue of the beauty of the land. Natural beauty will be sacrificed in all alternatives but 5, and 6. Why train people to run tanks to fight for the land while simultaneously wrecking up the most beautiful natural area in south Mississippi. It makes no sense to defend something by destroying it.

I find Alternatives 1 and 2 totally unacceptable. My choice is Alternative 5.

Sincerely yours,

Larry Gates

Larry Gates

84:9 Comment noted.

84:10 Comment noted. Please also see general misconception statement numbers 9, 10, and 11.

84:11 Comment noted.

84:12 See response to comment 62:1.

47 Brewer Rd
Purvis MS 39475
Dec 5, 1991

09 DEC REC'D

Dear Mr. McCreven

The Environmental Impact
Statement for Dade National
Forest was by National Guard
is in my hands but I need
time to look at it. I want to
comment. Please allow more
time. Your deadline are
unreasonably soon!

Larry Bates

84:12

47 Brewer Road
Purvis, MS 39475
February 26, 1992

Mobile District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers CESAM-PD-EI
Attn: Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am unequivocally opposed to the Camp Shelby land expansion. After reading the draft EIS, I find that it does not fulfill the master agreement between the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture. Nowhere in the draft EIS does it state that the DOD has provided evidence that there are no DOD lands available and suitable for the proposed tank training.

There are many reasons that I oppose the proposed expansion. These I have stated in my previous letters. Foremost among these is my concern for the fragile ecosystems which support many species of plants and wildlife, some of which are endangered. I

I wish to challenge the validity of the study regarding the red-cockaded woodpecker. This study was done by Dr. Jerome Jackson, an ornithologist at MS State University and nationally recognized authority on the red-cockaded woodpecker. Part of this study was done from the air which I have reason to believe is a very poor way to determine the existence or non-existence of this species. Several years ago I spent a weekend in Dr. Jackson's home along with several of his graduate students. Also present was Judith Toups, author of *Birds and Birding the Mississippi Gulf Coast*. Everyone there was knowledgeable about this species. Dr. Jackson showed us slides of areas where red-cockaded woodpeckers were known to nest. These slides were taken from the air with a telephoto lens. We were asked to pick out the nest sites. Our percentage of correct responses was pitiful. Dr. Jackson had previously identified these nest sites from the ground, but even so he was unable to find a large number of them from the aerial slides. Knowing Dr. Jackson and his concern for his credibility, I suspect that he would be the first to say that this method is not without its degree of error. I also understand that this study was done hastily over a short period of time. I suspect this was through no fault of Dr. Jackson. Why does the military wish to base its findings on such a study? This is as strange to me as the "sudden" disappearance of the last colony of these woodpeckers (draft EIS, Appendix N, page N-2): U.S. Forest Service personnel provided records of red-cockaded woodpeckers using land within the bounded area in Figure 1 (Appendix N, Page N-20) in January-February 1990. Is it mere coincidence that these birds conveniently vanished? Or did the DOD view them as

85:1 Comment noted. See misconception 5.
85:2 See responses to comments 2:31 and 2:6.
85:3 See response to comment 21:3.
85:4 See response to comment 51:16.
85:5 See response to comment 14:24.

85:1

85:2

85:3

85:4

85:5

85:6 Comment noted.

85:7 See response to comment 62:1.

"in the way"? No red-cockaded woodpeckers have been reported since the January-February 1990 sightings.

Having studied and photographed birds for a number of years, I am fully aware that along with many other species the red-cockaded woodpecker has declined in numbers. However, I would have to be an utter fool to believe that they ALL just vanished practically overnight!

I oppose alternative #1 and support alternative #4. Tanks do not belong in the national forests!

85:6

Sincerely,

Terrie Gates

Terrie Gates

47 Brewster Rd

Survivor
39475

09 DEC 1991

Dear Mr. Craven,

Please extend

Your deadline regarding

the EIS for Desoto

National Forest. ~~It~~

~~is~~ unreasonable

Considering the volume

of material to read,

Terrie

Gates

85:7

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Pat and Terry Gibbs

Feb. 20, 1991

Mr. Thomas Craven,

I am writing this letter to express my opposition to the current expansion program proposed by the National Guard at Camp Shelby. I am opposed to moving tank training deeper into the National Forest and into the Wildlife Management area.

I feel it is unnecessary to clear cut thousands of acres of forest and then burn up the land. Why can't they use treeless land? With the military catboats & graduation ball on H-1 tanks, why do they need increased training? The need for tank warfare in a tactical defense is becoming more and more remote. I think it is unnecessary use and a waste of taxpayer's money to increase this training.

Why can't they use training areas like they use in jet fighter training? In this part of the State National Forest there exists the only Wilderness Area and Wildlife Science Stream in this part of the country. This was established by Congress and set aside for the people. Thousands of people from all over the country come here every year to enjoy the recreational opportunities.

86:1 Comment noted.

86:2 See response to comment 2:31 and misconception 16.

86:3 See responses to comments 21:7 and 2:6 and misconception 8.

86:4 See response to comment 2:310.

86:5 Comment noted. No wilderness areas are involved in the proposed action. Please also see response to comment 21:8 and misconception 15.

86:6 Additional material has been added to the Final EIS (Sections 3.1.3, 3.1.5, 3.2.4, 3.3.3, 3.3.5, and 3.4.1.1). See also response to comment 21:4.

86:7 Comment noted. See response to comments 21:4, 21:3, 21:8, 3:12 and 17:5.

86:6

The noise pollution is bad enough right now. When they are firing artillery, it is heard a window rattles and you know as I signed

On Sat. night, Jan. 25th, firing went on from 11 p.m. to midnight. The noise in Brooklyn and our whole building shook with every firing. I called Camp Shelby and was told this particular unit had requested that firing time and they had to practice at night because all was all - not quiet during the daylight. From 11 p.m. to midnight! What about the thousands of people living in the area who were disturbed, irritated, & even frightened by this.

With more trees cut, the noise will be even louder. They say they will pull shells or bullets to buffer the noise. I'm not so sure that would work and if it doesn't, they can't put the trees back.

I object to this expense for the following reasons - noise pollution, destruction of trees and land waste of taxpayer money, no argument to wildlife, detrimental effects to recreational enjoyment. Please do not allow this to happen!

Pat J. Terry Little
1067 3rd Ave.; Laurel, Mo 3940
DBA Black Creek Game Land
P.O. Box 414; Brookline, Mo 39425

86:6

86:7

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Joseph Giliberti

208 N. 35th Ave.
Hattiesburg, MS 39401
February 21, 1992

Representative Gene Taylor
1429 Longworth Bldg.
Washington, DC 20515

Rep. Taylor:

This letter is an attempt to express my **strong opposition** to the proposed expansion of tank maneuver areas in the **Desoto National Forest**. Beyond the fact that I do not believe this land is necessary for maintaining the security of the U.S. at the present time, I further question how any individual could be convinced that this proposed expansion would be beneficial to the citizens of South Mississippi. The arguments presented by our "honorable" politicians and "unbiased" military personnel are unsubstantiated at best, and blatant propaganda at worst.

The questionable quality of the draft EIS is a good example of the lack of regard given to the interests of the land and citizens of South Mississippi in this case. As Forest Service Archaeologist for the Desoto National Forest, I was given the assignment of assessing the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers cultural impact study done for the proposed land exchange (now land expansion). This assessment was done in July and August of 1990. In brief, I concluded that no proper Cultural Resources Survey was ever conducted of the land exchange area. I found the report done by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Mobile District) an insult to me as an archaeologist, and to me as a citizen of South Mississippi. I feel the Corps displayed a total lack of concern for the cultural resources of the area. (For specific details of my objections to the Cultural Resources report please see the assessment presented to the U.S. Forest Service, August 1990.) If the cultural resources part of the draft EIS is indicative of the rest of the "study", then I have no doubt that we, the people of Mississippi, are being given the "royal shaft" in the case discussed here. In the least we deserve an unbiased and properly conducted EIS in order for us to make an informed decision on whether we want this expansion to take place. Further, I believe we need representation in the federal government that is interested in demanding that the interests and desires of the local populace are represented, such as demanding a proper EIS be conducted, or inquiring if the people want the expansion to occur at all.

As a registered voter from your district, I ask that **no** change be made in the current status of the Army's use of

87:1 Comment noted.

87:2 Comment noted. See response to comment 10:1.

87:3 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 10:8 and 10:9.


87:1

87:2

87:3

land in the Desoto National Forest. However, if any change should be necessary, I ask that a properly conducted EIS be made, by civilian agencies, before this change be allowed to take place. Further, if a change is to be made, let that change be alternative 3B, that alternative endorsed by the Citizens Against the Land Steal.

Sincerely:



Joseph A. Giliberti, Registered Voter

87:4

87:5

87:4 Comment noted. Please see also the responses to comments 87:2 and 87:3.

87:5 Comment noted. Please also see general misconception statement 7.

cc Senator Thad Cochran; Senator Trent Lott; Representative G.V. Montgomery; Mobile District, U.S. Corps of Engineers; Dale Robertson, Chief, U.S. Forest Service; Kenneth R. Johnson, MS State National Forest Supervisor; Colonel Pete Denton, Citizens Against the Land Steal

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Sarah Gillespie

PD-EL Low Cranon
U.S. Corps of Engineers
Mobile District
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

5606 avenue st
Hattiesburg, MS 39401
Feb 27, 1992

I realize the enclosed article is too long for you to read, but I agree with everything it says.

I have attended a number of meetings, forums, displays, etc. concerning this matter, & believe it is the best interest of all concerned for alternative 3B to be adopted. Alternative 1, which means the destruction of the entire Long River Wetlands Management Area is totally unacceptable.

When attending the recent Open House in Hattiesburg, Major Gary Harrington showed me a map of Alternative 1. He showed it as the "wetland area" which would not be used for training but later was encircled by training area. There are eight feeder streams into Black Creek & when I inquired about diking, no one from the Guard could answer.

The Black Creek area which would be affected by drainage from these eight streams is below the designated bird & game area, but would drastically affect recreation. Education below Fairley Bridge Landing.

I have no nested interest in any of this, but believe that some of the most sensitive avian proponents, probably do have.

Thanks you for your attention to this,
Sarah Gillespie

88:1

88:2

88:3

88:4

88:1 Comment Noted. See response to comments 3:12 and 17:5. Please also see general misconception statements 7 and 9.

88:2 Many designated wetlands extend from drainages into training areas. Neither the wetland itself nor its buffer area are proposed to be used for tracked vehicle maneuvers. They are subtracted from land otherwise proposed for maneuver, and will be marked on the ground to minimize accidental intrusion. Please also see Sections 3.2.2 and 3.4.5 of the Final EIS and the response to comments 10:5 and 14:46.

88:3 Please see Section 3.4.6.2 of the Final EIS and the response to comment 88:2.

88:4 Please see additional coverage in Sections 3.4.2 through 3.4.6 of the Final EIS.

February 28, 1992
Becky Gillette & Roger Danley
Rt. 1, Box 833
Hattiesburg MS 39401

Attn: PD-EI
Tom Craven
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Mobile District
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven,

The conclusion of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) that more than 300 huge tanks can train in the Desoto National Forest without any long-term damage to the environment is simply unsupported by the facts. Even if steps are taken to repair the damage after each training season, the large amount of rainfall that occurs in this part of the country (59 inches per year) will mean unavoidable amounts of silting and erosion in areas that drain into the Black Creek Wild and Scenic River. The loss of the hundreds of animals whose habitats would be destroyed by such training also would have a significant long-term negative in the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area.

Environmental damage from tank maneuvers of this scale are simply unavoidable. You can argue that such maneuvers are necessary to defense, but facts to support that conclusion are dismally lacking in days following the dismantling of the Soviet Union and the fall of the Iron Curtain.

Another argument is that expanded tank training is necessary for the economic health of the area. Again, considering the fact that the government plans large scale cutbacks in military funding, expansion of the training is no guarantee that Camp Shelby will not be affected by the military cutbacks, which have been estimated to be 30 percent in the next five years.

The majority of the proposed tank maneuver area of 39,772 acres covers land that has not been previously overrun by tanks. I propose instead that maneuvers be limited to areas that have already been repeatedly damaged by the tanks.

One argument I have heard by proponent of the tank training expansion is that the soils on the land in question are not "fragile". This is that same kind of short-sighted thinking that has led to high skin cancer rates resulting from the destruction of the ozone layer. A "mere" 39,772 acres is important to our environment. The long-leaf pine ecosystem in this area is one of the last major stands representing this important wildlife habitat in the U.S. While long-leaf pine once covered a very large portion of the Southeast, very little is now left. Destruction of the forest could lead to long-term loss of diversity of vital

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF Becky Gillette and Roger Danley

89:1 Comment noted. See response to comments 3:12 and 17:5.

89:2 Comment noted. See response to comments 10:5 and 14:46.

89:3 Comment noted. It is acknowledged that some species will decline following the alteration of habitat to facilitate training. It must also be recognized that these alterations will create other types of habitat as well and benefit other species.

Therefore, a different distribution of habitats will result and different species will respond to these changes accordingly. Special attention has been given to threatened and endangered species and management plans have been developed in cooperation with and approved by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for the protection and management of their habitats. The habitats of threatened and endangered species also provide habitat for other species. Please also refer to Misconception 14 and response to Comments 2:132, 14:28, and 89:10.

89:4 See response to comment 2:6.

89:5 See response to comment 35:12. Refer to Misconceptions 3 and 25.

89:6 Comment noted. The range of alternatives includes varying amounts of areas now used for tracked vehicle maneuver, including Alternative 4, where all proposed areas are now authorized for maneuver. See Section 1.2.1 and Table 1-4 in the Final EIS.

89:7 See response to comment 1:10.

89:8 Comment noted. See response to comments 3:12 and 17:5 and misconception 9.

importance. We can not continue to blindly consume and destroy our natural resources without eventually destroyed entire ecosystems that vitally effect the health of the planet.

89:8

I have some serious concerns about the validity of some of the studies included in the DEIS. For example, the survey of the area for the endangered Red-cockaded Woodpecker was done in a manner that made it impossible to accurately determine if any of these endangered birds are nesting in the area. The survey for the DEIS was done from a helicopter, while controlled studies have shown that experts who have already identified nesting sites from the ground are unable to pick out those nesting sites with any degree of accuracy from the air.

89:9

Bird population have decreased 40 percent or more on military bases with training such as is proposed here. The DEIS should include information about the quantity and species of birds in the areas, and the expected decline in these species as a result of the training.

89:10

I can find no evidence of the Department of Defense (DOD) requirement that there has been "a determination the DOD that lands under its administration are unsuitable or unavailable" for the training. This evidence should be included in the DEIS.

89:11

The DEIS does not contain adequate proposals for monitoring of surface water or ground waters. These should be included in the final EIS.

89:12

Repeatedly in areas already under use for tank training in DeSoto National forest, soil erosion correction measures were taken after considerable damage was already done or weren't undertaken at all. Range 50 is an example where no effort was made to hold silt for nearly nine months after the silt was cleared. Can you provide any real proof that the same thing will not happen in the tank training area is expanded.

89:13

Regarding of the pro-Guard sentiment that these areas are not "fragile", they are much less environmentally sensitive areas such as deserts where tank training would cause much less damage to the environment. Vegetation and animal life in a desert areas is less than a hundredth of that in the densely populated forest areas of south Mississippi.

89:14

The effect of noise pollution on humans and animals in the area is another factor that has not been considered adequately. Please give it more consideration in the final EIS.

89:15

Sincerely,
Becky Gillette
Becky Gillette & Roger Danley

89:9 See response to comment 51:16.

89:10 Bird population reductions on other military installations have been attributed to similar types of activities proposed on Camp Shelby. However, it is important to recognize the significant ecological differences between Camp Shelby and those installations cited in the DEIS. Concerning impacts to specific bird species, please see response to comment 14:16 and Table 3-27 in the Final EIS.

89:11 See response to comment 2:31.

89:12 Please see Sections 3.1.1.5 and 3.4.6.2 of the Final EIS

89:13 Following the implementation of ITAM, and with current major staff additions to the Camp Shelby environmental office, 100% of the annual erosion control program has been completed in 1992 and 1993. Thus, it is much less likely that a situation such as you describe will occur at the present. Please also see Section 3.4 of the Final EIS.

89:14 Contrary to popular belief, the desert is an extremely fragile environment; more fragile than many areas of the country where rainfall is more abundant. Please also see general misconception statement 16.

89:15 Please see response to comment 21:4.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Doris Gillie

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PREPARE FIRST

Name: Doris Gillie

Address: 233 St John Rd

City: Brooklyn State: MS Zip: 39425

Camp Shelby Training Site
Special Use Permit
Draft EIS
Public Comment Meetings
Gulfport, MS
January 8, 1982

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:

90:1 Road Closures were not addressed. What will be the impact on school bus routes and mail routes?

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:

90:2 The impact on area residents due to increased tank maneuvering and increased traffic was not addressed. Many residents live on these roads and travel these roads.

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:

90:3 The effects of noise from Tanks, helicopters and jets on area residents and churches were not addressed.

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:

90:4 Why was the study of the effects on timber done for only 40 years? Timber takes approximately 60 years to mature - then a much greater impact will be realized.

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:

90:5 Why was the noise study done in another state with a computer program? Why was no onsite study done? You put had information in a computer you get had information back!

OSJAN Form 1164-1 (One-Time)

Dec 91

Page 1 of 1

90:1 Please see Sections 3.3.3 and 3.3.5 of the Final EIS. Please also see response to comments 2:244, 51:3, and 51:4.

90:2 See response to comment 9:1.

90:3 See response to comment 21:4

90:4 See response to comment 51:1.

90:5 Comment noted. Because weapons firing noise is extremely difficult to measure, these noise effects are calculated, based on number of rounds fired. Local atmospheric conditions will often result in higher levels being experienced at a location than are predicted by the model. This is discussed in Sections 2.3.2 and 3.1.5 of the Final EIS. Please also see the response to comment 63:10, 63:11, and 63:12

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Kim Gillie

Kim Gillie
228 St John Rd
Brooklyn, Ms. 39425

- 91:1 See response to comment 51:1.
91:2 See response to comment 51:2.
91:3 See response to comment 51:3.
91:4 See response to comment 51:4.
91:5 See response to comment 51:5.

91:1	<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 1 RESOURCE AREA:</p> <p>Why was the study of the effects on the timber industry done for a period of 40 years? The study should have covered at least 60 to 70 years when the lost timber would have matured. Your study of the timber industry appears to be slanted in favor of the National Guard.</p>
91:2	<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 2 RESOURCE AREA:</p> <p>The effects of noise from increased tank maneuvering, increased helicopters, and increased jet aircraft firing was not addressed pertaining to the Cypress Creek Missionary Baptist Church and their church services. This church is located on Highway 29 near the South Fork crossing.</p>
91:3	<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 3 RESOURCE AREA:</p> <p>Road Closures on Highway 29 and other area roads were not addressed. We travel these roads to work and to school.</p>
91:4	<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 4 RESOURCE AREA:</p> <p>The effect on area school bus routes was not addressed. Many children live in the area there is an increased danger due to increased traffic and tank activity. This is a great concern!</p>
91:5	<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 5 RESOURCE AREA:</p> <p>What is the conflict of the land to be turned back over to the Forest Service. Since this has been a tank maneuvering area, how long will it take and what action will have to be taken to make this land suitable for timber production?</p>

Kim Gillie
228 St John Rd
Brooklyn, Ms. 39425

- 91:6 See response to comment 51:6.
91:7 See response to comment 51:7.
91:8 See response to comment 51:8.
91:9 See response to comment 51:9.
91:10 See response to comment 51:10.
91:11 See response to comment 51:11.

91:6	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 6	RESOURCE AREA:
	Who will be responsible for the road and bridge damage caused by National Guard?	
91:7	Will the National Guard keep public roads in good condition for local residents?	
	Will compensation be made to the County for damage caused by National Guard?	
91:8	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 7	RESOURCE AREA:
	Only hunting recreation during deer season was addressed. What about other	
	hunting seasons: turkey, rabbit, squirrel? Will Camp Shelby stop maneauvera RND	
	open the Forest to these sportsmen too?	
91:9	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 8	RESOURCE AREA:
	Your noise study is a joke. Accounting the EIS, this study was done completely	
	with a computer program. Why was no on-site monitoring done?	
91:10	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 9	RESOURCE AREA:
	Firing and ordinance detonation is not the only noise problem. Why was	
	the increased tracked vehicle and increased helicopter and jet noises not	
	addressed in the EIS? Why was the effects on the quality of life for the	
	adjacent residents not addressed? Why was vibration from the shelling not	
91:11	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 10	RESOURCE AREA:
	The part of the noise study based on past noise complaints is inaccurate.	
	Area residents have quit calling in complaints because the National Guard often	
	ignored them and seldom made any effort to correct the problem. It is assumed	
	phonecall. The last time I called Range Control, I was told by the Officer that	
	he would come out in a few minutes to see what really happened.	

Kim Gillie
228 St John Rd
Brooklyn, Ms. 39425

91:12 See response to comment 51:12.

91:13 See response to comment 51:13.

91:14 See response to comment 51:14.

91:15 See response to comment 51:15.

91:16 See response to comment 51:16.

91:12	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 12 RESOURCE AREA: Why did the EIS not cover the impact on the citizens living adjacent to the proposed tank training area and firing ranges?
91:13	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 13 RESOURCE AREA: The US Military Training Base Effects Study that three areas of Zone II communities (52-70 cecils) are located near small communities. No maps show these communities and the effect on the residents is not addressed. The US Military Base II area is near Granger. No maps show this area. No one from the National Guard, Corps of Engineers, or the Forest Service could tell me where Granger is located. I have lived in the area all my life, and have never heard of such a place.
91:14	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 14 RESOURCE AREA: How are the area residents to be compensated for the loss in value of their land and homes due to the adjacent tank maneuvers and other training activities?
91:15	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 15 RESOURCE AREA: In the "List of Persons Contacted in the Course of This Study", why were no area residents included in the study?
91:16	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 16 RESOURCE AREA: The study on the red-cockaded woodpecker is inconclusive. An accurate count and identification of the woodpecker and active and inactive colonies can not be accomplished by helicopter.

Brooklyn, MS.
Feb. 24, 1992

Mobile District U.S. Army Corps
of Engineers CESAM-PD-EI
Attn: Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Sir

My wife and I live just a few hundred yards from an active tank trail that crosses 29 Hwy. in Perry county. Like many other people in the panice community I am retired and very much enjoy where I live. I had to give up 40 acres of my land in the mid 80's to the national guard. My brother, brother-in-law, and two of my nieces had to give up their homes.

Some people think the De Soto National Forest just grew like weeds. They think it would be alright to have tanks running around over some of the best parts of this area. It took many years, hard work, and dedication to grow this beautiful productive forest.

I am a disabled combat veteran of World War II. I know we need adequate defence to protect our interest around the world. Turning tank loose to damage our land and timber is not a good idea now or in the future.

Our support troops did a good job in Desert Storm. The GAO study said the 155 Armored had shortcomings. The lack of training space was not one of them.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Nathan Gillie

92:1 Comment noted.

92:2 Comment noted.

92:3 Comment noted.

92:4 See response to comment 2:6.

92:1

92:2

92:3

92:4

A line near the oldest wildlife management area in the state. one does not have to be a genius to know tanks have no business in that area.

If the National Guard cuts and thins the timber the way the EIS says, there will be a short supply of timber some time down the road.

The type of soil and rolling hills we have in this area needs something growing at all times. If not the soil will wash into the creeks, into the rivers, and end up in the Gulf.

These are just a few of the drawbacks to expanding tank training in the De Soto National Forest.

Thank you for reading my letter.

Yours Truly,
Nathan Hurley Gillie

92:5

92:5 Comment noted.

92:6

The National Forests in Mississippi Land and Resource Management Plan projects the long term sustained yield (LTSY) for timber production to be reached during the third plan period (i.e., 2005 through 2014). LTSY is at a level approximately 50% higher than today's timber sale volume. We are currently at the end of the first plan period. Even though some 20,000 acres will be taken out of timber production, there will still be more timber available from the National Forest for sale in the future than there is today. See expanded discussion in Sections 3.3.2.3 and 3.3.4.3.

92:7

92:7 Comment noted. Please response to comments 10:5 and 14:46.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FIRMLY

Name: <u>Nathan H. Gilie</u> Address: <u>2754 Hwy 29</u> <u>Brooklyn MS. 39425</u> City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
92:8	Most people in Perry County are against tanks in our forest. Many men spent long hours of hard work to grow this forest. Starting in 1930's C.C. boys worked to build Deata National Forest.	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
92:9	Many people in Perry County want to make money at Perry County's expense.	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
92:10	Letting the Co. H Engineers do the E.D. is like letting the fox guard the hen house. The forest belongs to all the people.	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
92:11	It doesn't make sense to use tanks in Deata National Forest when there will be no need for them in this type area anyway.	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
92:11	One of our Main Industries is forest products industry. Our main source to run this County comes from Deata National Forest.	

- 92:8 Comment noted.
- 92:9 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 6:5 and 30:2.
- 92:10 Comment noted. See response to comment 2:6.
- 92:11 Comment noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF James Gosseink

TO: Mobile District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile AL 36628-0001

ATTN: Thomas M. Craven

February 25, 1992

RE: Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement: Military Training
Use of National Forest Lands, Camp Shelby, Mississippi, dated November
1991.

The following comments relate to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for military training use of parts of the DeSoto National Forest by the U.S. Army base at Camp Shelby. This response is on behalf of the Mississippi chapter of the Sierra Club and Stop the Land Swap. I make the comments as a professional ecologist with over 20 years of experience in coastal, plant and landscape ecology and resource management.

At issue in this document is the expansion of military training facilities at the expense of natural forest resources during a time when the defense budget is being severely cut, military threats to the U.S. are perceived as decreasing globally, and military bases are being closed. Why then is this serious and expensive environmental incursion being proposed. It hardly seems cost effective from the government's point of view. If the proposed training is really needed wouldn't it be preferable to use alternate sites - for example one of the bases scheduled for closure - to accomplish the training mission?

That fundamental question aside, the EIS is seriously flawed and should, I believe, be entirely re-written if it is to have any validity. The volumes are extensive. Therefore, I focus specific comments on the conclusions in the summary section 4, in Volume 1, since this section synthesizes the details found elsewhere in the volumes. I also confine comments to the Army's preferred option, Alternate 1. Key tables 4-1 and 4-2 show the expected direction of impacts, and each environmental topic is discussed individually in pages 4-6 through 4-9.

1) Soil disturbance is described as (-) during the construction phase and in short term, and (-) long term; and soil erosion losses are minor (-) in short term and neutral (0) long term. This conclusion rests on assumptions that mitigation procedures will be effective in essentially halting erosion in the long term. This is an important assumption, and one not borne out by a reading of the rest of the document. Specifically, with respect to erosion, surveys of effectiveness of mitigation in 1989-91 (Table 3-15) show rather poor ground cover in 1989 and 1991 during the training season. Is there no erosion during the summer, even though the document comments on the high, evenly spaced annual rainfall? On close reading, the table shows percent canopy cover, which in 1990 (when the survey was conducted after replanting in the inactive season, and showed high percentage cover) included overstory trees as well as ground cover. Litter was also considered as ground cover. Only a living ground cover with extensive root system is effective in retarding erosion. The table is therefore misleading. The Army apparently expects to do a better job of mitigation in the future - if its mitigation process is fully funded, but there is little evidence that this is feasible. Another issue with regard to soil disturbance and erosion is rainfall. This is admitted to be a problem, but is minimized in the discussion, and ignored in the final rating. In fact, a look at rain probability - about 1 day in 6 - and training frequency - about 4 days in 7 during a 2-week training session - gives an overall

93:1 Comment noted.

93:2 See response to comment 2:6.

93:3 See response to comment 2:31

93:4 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 2:347.

93:5 Preparers note that the comparisons are to the present condition, and not to an untouched environment, and, further, they relate to the entire permit area, not solely the newly-developed maneuver areas. Thus, the estimates are supportable, assuming a proactive revegetation program combined with other protective measures. Please also see Sections 3.4.2, 3.4.3, and 3.4.4 of the Final EIS.

93:6 Comment noted. It is acknowledged that different measures of cover were used. Total cover and canopy cover are two types of measure. Preparers agree that a living cover with extensive root system is the best cover, but continue to believe that canopy, litter, and other elements of total cover are effective in absorbing rain fall energy.

93:7 Comment noted. See response to comments 7:4, 7:17, and 7:24.

93:8 Comment noted. The National Guard agrees that weather conditions may require modification of training activities, and has developed, jointly with the Forest Service, a decision matrix to be used in such situations. See Section 3.4.3.1 of the Final EIS.

93:1

93:2

93:3

93:4

93:5

93:6

93:7

93:8

probability of rain during any one training session of about 20% (1/6 x 4/7 = 4/42 each week for 2 weeks). If there are 8 sessions per year the expectation is that at least one of them will get rain. The document admits that this poses a disturbance problem. My image of 10 or 20 ton tracked vehicles wallowing around in the mud certainly confirms that. Even with the best mitigation, I don't see how the damage can be eliminated, nor the erosion stopped. Finally, tests of buffer strips showed that they were essentially ineffective in stopping sediment flow from eroding areas into nearby wetlands and waterways (about 1% of the total sediment yield was captured, page 3-104). In effect, there is nothing in the document but wishful thinking to suggest soil disturbance and erosion will not be cumulatively detrimental.

2) Surface Water Quality and Wetland Integrity ratings both follow from Soil Erosion Losses. Therefore they get the same ratings, or in the case of long term wetland integrity, a better rating (+). As noted above, the arguments for minimal soil erosion are based on wishful thinking rather than demonstrably effective mitigation. It is much more realistic to expect serious water quality and wetland integrity problems, with cumulative degradation occurring over time as wetlands and streams are overwhelmed with sediments. Wetland integrity is presumed to improve, presumably because of better management. But the management is simply to put them off limits. At best, why should they improve over wetlands that are simply left alone as they would be without the project?

3) The topics of Ground Cover, TE&S species, Wildlife Habitat, Small/Big Game Species, and Biodiversity are interrelated and will be discussed together. In the long term Ground Cover is presumed to change negligibly, while all the others are positively impacted by the project. Again, this appears to be wishful thinking which ignores most of the facts stated in the EIS. We know that Alternative 1 involves a harvest of 21,217 acres, less a turnback of 10,809 acres, for a net loss of 10,408 acres (Table 3-12). In addition 7,112 acres will be thinned (Table 3-13). This issue of a net loss of about 18,000 acres of forest is buried somewhere in the EIA and does not appear in summary Tables 4-1 or 4-2, not in the discussion of these tables. Nobody in his right mind would consider this a negligible loss, especially since this is not a one time clearing with regrowth, but rather a permanent loss of tree canopy. This ecological change is addressed in the topics listed above, but only indirectly. For example, Ground Cover apparently refers narrowly to whether or not something is growing on the ground cover "will be managed as open there is presumed to be no effect because the ground cover "will be managed as open herbaceous areas, and with proposed mitigation procedures little change from the current status is expected" (page 4-7). Is this saying that there is no ecological difference between forest cover and herbs (presumably grasses), over 10,400 acres? Ecologically, that is nonsense! Because the trees are cut to leave forest islands and corridors, habitat for wildlife is projected to improve and biodiversity to remain the same compared to the Forest Service normal harvest schedule. This is because edge habitat will increase, stimulating biodiversity and creating a more diverse habitat for wildlife. I agree that game species will increase (if disturbance from maneuvers is ignored), but other wildlife is a different picture. First, there will be an overall decrease of primary production (10,000 acres worth) and therefore of biological energy to fuel the food chain. Second, habitat diversity will not improve. The Forest Service harvest rotation is about 50 years, during which time two to three thinings take place. The 50 year cycle means that on average no more than 2% of the forest can be cut every year to maintain the mandated sustained yield harvest. The remaining 98% of the forest is in various age and thinning stands, so that overall the forest must contain considerable habitat diversity. Third, the document is clear that, while overall species diversity is expected to remain the same (i.e. the diversity index is unchanged), the species composition will change. Since edge species will increase the implication is that interior forest species will decrease. It is these latter species that are most negatively affected by most human activity, and whose populations tend to be decreasing all over the

93:9 Comment noted. Buffer strips alone are not proposed, in the Final EIS, as the sole measure to prevent sediment movement into wetlands and surface water. See Sections 3.3.1.4, 3.3.1.5.1, 3.3.1.5.2, 3.4.2, and 3.4.5 of the Final EIS.

93:10 See response to comment 93:9.

93:11 Comments noted. Commentor's interpretation of the reasons for marking Wetland Integrity are essentially correct, but the comparison is with present conditions rather than an ideal situation. The widespread marking of wetlands associated with presently used areas is the element projected to cause the improvement.

93:12 Comment noted. Please see additional coverage in Sections 3.3.2.6, 3.4.10 and 3.5.7 of the Final EIS.

93:13 Comment noted. Yes, ground cover includes all types of cover as discussed in response to comment 93:6. Document did not claim there were no ecological differences among cover types, but that completeness of cover was the important factor in minimizing soil loss.

93:14 An interagency committee reached agreement on a revised definition for biodiversity to be used throughout the Final EIS (Sections 1.2.1.4.3, 2.4.7, 3.3.2.6, 3.4.10, and 3.5.7). Please also see response to comments 1:9 and 1:11.


93:15 One recommendation of the interagency committee (see 93:14) was in defining biodiversity in terms of the indigenous or naturally occurring species. Thus, the subsequent fragmentation of the De Soto forest into numerous, well defined stand (species) and age class combinations by private landowners as well as the Forest Service also represents a departure from what would have been expected prior to the arrival of European settlers.

93:16 Comment noted. Please see Section 3.3.2.6 of the Final EIS for a discussion of this issue, and the response to comment 93:14.

nation. There is seldom lack of forest edge anymore, since forest fragmentation is the rule rather than the exception. There is, however, a real lack of large forest blocks that provide protection for shy interior species. The EIS should recognize this important concept. In this context it is clear that biodiversity and wildlife (not game) habitat will be seriously degraded by Alternative 1.

Perhaps the most egregious assertion is that TE&S species will, in the long run, benefit from the proposed action. With few exceptions TE&S species are that way because of habitat disturbance. A few species (alligator, for example) are endangered because of hunting pressure, but none of the species mentioned in the EIS are in that category. They fit under the class of animals whose narrow niches have been lost or degraded through human activity. Although I am unable to comment on gopher tortoise habitat requirements, the suggestion that good management (by which is meant isolation by a minimum of 200 feet) should improve RCW habitat and hence species numbers, is simply not borne out by experience. The EIS states that no inhabited RCW nests occur in Camp Shelby. Could this be because of disturbance from shell bursting around the nests, huge noisy tanks roaring around the forest, humans swarming over the ground? The EIS cites a number of studies that found reduced avian and small mammal biomass from tracked vehicle activity, as well as a shift in species composition and relative abundance (page 3-81). The expectation, in fact, is that common edge species that adapt easily to human disturbance will probably hold their own or increase in abundance, but that shy, reclusive, interior forest species and species with narrow niches will decline in numbers and in density. The threatened RCW, for example, is declining in numbers in the DeSoto National Forest despite the best efforts of the Forest Service to isolate their nests.

Sincerely yours,



James G. Gosselink
Professor Emeritus
Department of Oceanography and Coastal Sciences
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803

93:17

93:18

93:19

93:20

93:21

93:17 See response to 93:16.

93:18 Comment noted. See Section 3.5.7 of the Final EIS.

93:19 No benefits to listed species are proposed in the Final EIS. The benefits suggested in the Draft EIS were anticipated as a result of Camp Shelby's aggressive environmental awareness program and adherence to guidelines set forth by the USFWS and USFS, and have now largely been realized. In the USFWS recent Biological Opinion on the Gopher tortoise (September 1992), human predation was also cited as a major factor in the decline of the tortoise. Therefore, the temporary closure of, or access restrictions on, areas occupied by the gopher tortoises (e.g., the GT refuge) is thought to afford a small degree of protection (benefit) from human predation and is thus considered a benefit. The decline of the RCW in the rest of the De Soto National Forest is discussed in section 2.4.5.1.1 of the FEIS. It is clear that hurricane Fredrick (1970) directly accelerated the decline of the De Soto RCW population. The picture which the commentor evokes of "shells bursting around the nests" does not happen and has not taken place since at least the time the species was listed. Please refer to section 3.1.2.5 of the Final EIS. See response to comments 1:2, 14:6, and 14:22.

93:20 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 93:12 and 93:14.

93:21 Comment noted.

14 FEB 1992

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Carolyn Graves

Thomas M. Claver
Crops Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Claver,
I am writing this letter
to voice my opposition to the
expansion of the tank-tramping
in the Desoto National
Forest.

I feel that increased
tank maneuvers would
damage trees, plants and
wildlife not to mention
the loss of recreational
facilities I have personally
enjoyed all of my life.

Please remember, the
Desoto National Forest
should be allowed to
remain in its present
state of beauty.

Thank you for your consideration.

Carolyn Graves
P.O. Box 154
Macedon, MS 39459

- 94:1 Comment noted. Please see misconception 5.
94:2 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 21:3
94:3 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 21:8.
94:4 Comment noted.
94:5 Comment noted.

94:1

94:2

94:3

94:4

94:5

Clayton D. Griffith
5721 Alkali Way
Diamondhead, MS 39520
February 25, 1992

Thomas M. Crauen
Corps of Engineers
PO Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Sir:

I wish to submit my strongest possible objection to the Army's proposal for extended tank training at Camp Shelby.

I think it is ludicrous for the Army in its present stance of drawdown by thousands, base closings throughout the country and a recommended reduction of the National Guard to proceed with expansion of Camp Shelby and the adversities accompanying such an intrusion. Perhaps the Mississippi National Guard has not yet learned that DoD has stopped production of the M-1 tank and axed the budget for advanced tank research which would impact in the near future and long term on expanded tank training.

The expanded tank training would be so destructive to the fragile ecosystem of the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area that it would never fully recover once the Army clean-cut and ran 60 ton tanks through the area. Natural drainage through the area would be so disturbed that water sources not only in the proposed area but also surrounding area would be affected.

One of the basic considerations for this proposal is the question of what is the Army's mission that needs "reconfigured tracked vehicle maneuver areas to more closely reflect military doctrine". Just what is military doctrine as it might pertain to tank training in such a green and forested area when tactical scenarios of potential future hot spots include the evolving countries of the Soviet Union and the desert regions of The Middle East. How does such tank training at Camp Shelby and the expanded area contribute to desert maneuvers - with substantially different land mass, temperature and ground cover conditions?

Sincerely

Clayton D. Griffith
Clayton D. Griffith

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Clayton Griffith

95:1 Comment noted.

95:2 See responses to comments 21:7 and 2:6. See general misconception statements 5 and 8.

95:3 Please see response to comment 21:3, 3:12 and 17:5.

95:4 Comment noted. Planned development excludes all stream beds, wetlands, and their respective buffers. Structural protection will be added where necessary to retard soil loss. Drainage patterns should not be seriously affected.

95:5 See responses to comments 2:31 and 2:6.

95:1

95:2

95:3

95:4

95:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Annie Gunn

96:1 Comment noted.

The newspaper clippings referred to are not reproduced here. The writers of these letters have submitted the same comments directly, and they have been answered individually elsewhere.

*Please read these letters to
the Editor. They present the
situation & my feelings eloquently
& eloquently... and please pay heed*

*Annie G. Gunn
Jackson*

96:1

2/19/92 Clarion Ledger letters to the editor included with this letter have not been reproduced in this FEIS.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

William Guyton

81 JAN REC'D

Dear Army Corp of Engineers,

This letter is to express my sentiments to you over the land acquisition (previously "Land Swap") by the Mississippi National Guard at Camp Shelby and the concerns of many citizens of southern Mississippi. After two years of closely following both sides of the issue, it has become obvious that the detriments of the Land Acquisition still far outweigh the benefits for my fellow citizens in this area. Our public forest, its wildlife and natural resources, should not be further jeopardized for the sake of National Guard tank training. The economic impact on forestry workers, the logging industry, hunting, tourism and recreation partly offsets the only strong argument that proponents for the Camp Shelby expansion hold, that being jobs. I keep in mind also that these are government supported jobs that may be subject to inevitable Defense Dept. budget cuts in the next few years regardless of Camp Shelby's expansion. The curious aspect of this issue is the National Guard's failure to tell the public their military mission, global strategy, or defense purpose for such expansion. For me, the justification appears weak considering the global political and military situation, the National Guard's failure in implementing updated skills, equipment, and physical conditioning (Gulf War), and the Defense Department reversing their "Round Out" policy degrading the priority of the Guard in international conflicts.

To try and sum up the players in this issue, as I see it, is on one side a group of military and some civilian personnel trying to avoid Defense Dept. cuts by upgrading their training base. Of course hotel and nightclub owners, the only businesses to really be affected economically by Camp Shelby summer personnel, are also proponents. Overall, Forrest County tax receipts during Camp Shelby training periods have shown no real increase in consumer spending.

On the other side of the issue are the citizens asking lots of valid questions. Some of them can be listed as such: 1) Where in the E.I.S. are the detailed studies of recent fieldwork concerning the fauna, flora, and historical sites? 2) What about the long term affect on the timber industry and timber tax receipts? 3) If you subsidize the taxes lost in timber that go to schools and roads in the 3 surrounding counties, won't that come out of the taxpayers pockets instead of private timber industry tax outlays? 4) You have shown that little can be done to prevent soil erosion during the 4 months during tank training. 5) Why 2 years ago did the "Land Swap" deal try and quickly pass without the allowance of any public opinion (the "Swap" was shrouded in controversial tactics used by the National Guard, one resulting in the firing of the adjutant general at Camp Shelby). 6) If you are concerned with the social impact, what about the people living around the area who endure the noises of such areal and tank training not to mention the loss to hunters and recreationalists. 7) Why were no independent environmental agencies allowed to go in and do their own studies and what about the fate of the near pristine eco-system in and around the impact areas? (Remember, displacement of animals due to man-made disturbances

97:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 12.

97:2 Comment noted.

97:3 See response to comments 21:5, 21:2, and 21:8 and general misconception statements 5 and 25.

97:4 See response to comment 2:6. See general misconception statement 5.

97:5 See Section 1.1.2.3 of the Final EIS, the response to comment 2:6, and misconception 8.

97:6 Refer to Misconception 25. No increase in tax revenues is claimed. However, under the action alternatives a decrease in revenues may be avoided.

97:7 Almost all the data referred to are the result of original field studies. See Appendix Q of the Final EIS and responses to Comments 10:8 and 14:13.

97:8 Please see additional coverage in Section 3.3.2.3 and 3.3.2.3.1 of the Final EIS and response to 21:5.

97:9 It is anticipated that county returns will stabilize at pre-implementation levels due to increased growth and harvest on remaining acreages. There are no plans to subsidize the counties for potential loss of future revenues. See the additional write-up on county returns in Sections 2.6.3.1 and 3.3.4.3.1 of the Final EIS.

97:10 The concern of unacceptable erosion during the active training period is covered by Clauses 38 and 41 of the Special Use Permit, and it is covered under the term "hot spots" in Section 3.4.3.1 of the Final EIS.

97:11 As examined in Section 1.1.4 of both the Draft and Final EIS, the Army was requested to determine whether or not any National Forest lands could be exchanged for the 16,000 acres of Army land in Colorado which were proposed to be transferred to the National Forest system. Several possible locations in different states were examined, with Camp Shelby being rated the installation with the greatest need. The intensity of public controversy was clearly underestimated.

97:12 See response to comment 21:8, 21:4, and 21:6.

97:13 Comment noted. Representatives of many universities did take part in the field studies, and the Natural Heritage Program is currently performing a comprehensive survey for all potential threatened, endangered and sensitive species. Please also see response to comment 14:13 and misconceptions 8 and 13.

97:13

and noise can have the same results as running over them with tanks) 8) Why destroy large tracks of National Forest for the sake of National Guard tank training that is already developed at bases in Georgia and Texas, for the sake of increasing some local jobs? 9) Why the use of outdated and more environmentally destructive M-1 tanks in a pine forest simulation, and where would this training ever be necessary. 10) Can a compromise be reached for some expansion in the northern sector to ensure those Camp Shelby jobs, leaving the more valued public lands to the south alone (the E.I.S.'s alternatives #3b, #4, and #5 include such compromises)?

From even a conservative environmental perspective on this issue, surely a compromise can be reached. Alternatives generated by the Army in their E.I.S., such as the one labeled "#3b", offers Camp Shelby thousands of acres of expansion in the existing northern training areas as well as land for many new cantonment, storage, and tank facilities. This same alternative still preserves the virgin southern areas as well as existing or even increased Camp Shelby jobs. However, alternatives #4, #5, and #6 are preferable from the conservationist standpoint. I feel, as most of the opposition groups now do, that if Camp Shelby obtains rights to lands for tank training south of county road #303, a new battle for this National Guard base will emerge as the citizens of South Mississippi will cry out for the return of their National Forest.

Please help me and many concerned South Mississippians in influencing the necessary parties that a large scale expansion of tank training (E.I.S. Alternatives #1, #2, #3a) is not necessary for local and national interests and extremely detrimental to the humans, plants, and animals living in and around this beautiful area contained within public lands. Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

William Ernie Guyton

97:20

97:14 See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31 and misconceptions 9 and 25..

97:15 The need for continued armor and mechanized training in a forested setting appears to be well aligned to the emerging role for United States forces in many smaller regional conflicts. See responses to comments 21:7, 2:6 and 2:31

97:16 Alternatives 3A, 4, 5, and 6 were all examined in the decision making process. Alternative 3B is impossible to implement; please see misconception 7.

97:17 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 7, 10, 11 and 25.

97:18 Comment noted.

97:19 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 5 and 19.

97:20 Comment noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Robert Hall

February 24, 1992
Ocean Springs Ms 39564

Mr. Thomas M. Cravens
Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile Ala 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Cravens:

I am writing in opposition to the taking of the Desoto National Forest around Hattiesburg. I am from Central Mississippi and drive up fairly often. Between here and Carthage there is nothing left but cut over land and streams that are filling. Mississippi looks like Mt. St. Helens after the big blast. Timber has been cut and the land raped from sea to shining sea. I expect that this grab for land is nothing more than a need for timber to feed the big mills located on the rivers in South Miss.

In a few years if the greedy politicians and greedy thugs running the big businesses have there way there will be nothing left but a vast waste land of filled and polluted streams, red hills washing down to the gulf. Why not leave these few acres of trees and greenery for our grand children to see? In this age of disarmament why do we need more land. Aren't we closing bases why do we need more land? There are vast wastelands over this entire country. Why not take some of the land already wasted by the timber companies or wasted by the corps of engineers in some of their project.

Again let me say if there was no timber on this land I doubt that anyone would be interested in this land. But all the land grabs in this country have been about Oil, Gold, Timber and anything else to sell for a dollar and this sir is no different.

Respectfully yours

Robert A. Hall

Robert A. Hall
224 Mitchell St.
Ocean Springs Ms 39564

98:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 12.

98:2 There is no plan to acquire title to National Forest administered land to implement any of the alternatives. The land is presently under permit. The type of use permitted would change with the military's preferred alternative. See also misconception statement 12.

There are no plans to increase the amount of timber going on the market as a result of any of the alternatives considered. See additional coverage in Sections 3.3.2.3 and 3.3.4.3 of the Final EIS.

98:3 Comment noted.

98:4 See response to comment 2:6 and misconception 8.

98:5 See response to comment 2:31

98:6 Comment noted. See also misconception 16.

98:1

98:2

98:3

98:4

98:5

98:6

SECRET
COL USA RET

US Army Corp of Engineers, Mobile Dist
PO Box 12238

Mobile AL 36628-0001 23 Feb 1992

The Purpose of this letter is to voice my opposition to the Takeover of the Leaf Run Wildlife Management Area for the purpose of using it as a Tank Training Area in the proposed expansion of Camp Shelby, Mississippi.

As a retired Regular Army Officer with thirty-two years of active military service, I am in no way anti military, nor am I opposed to providing the best available training facilities to our Forces.

However, at this time of declining military need and budgeting for same, and considering the excess Tank Training Areas already available in other areas of the Country, I object to spending new money to duplicate these facilities, and in the process needlessly destroy thousands of acres of National Forest and the oldest Wildlife Management Area in Mississippi.

I would support any alternative to as a compromise to all concerned.

Peter J. Hirsch
COL USA RET

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Peter Hirsch

99:1 See general misconception statements 5, 12, and 23.

99:2 See responses to comments 2:6, 2:31, and 35:12 and misconceptions 9 and 14.

99:3 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 7.

99:1

99:2

99:3

Thomas Hale
382 Paddock Drive West
Savoy, IL 61874

February 26, 1992

Mr. Tom Craven
CECER-PD-EI
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

This letter is in reference to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement: "Military Training Use of National Forest Lands: Camp Shelby, Mississippi." After studying different aspects of the document, I would like to make several comments concerning content and format.

I examined three issues of interest to me, which included: land use, noise, and aesthetic amenities in relation to the proposed alternatives' impacts. The comments concerning these areas are listed below:

Land use

*The existence of mineral deposits is acknowledged, but quantities, locations, and impacts are neglected (especially the natural gas & oil). 100:1

*Descriptions concerning a method to determine wetland buffers are unclear. Compare sections 1.0.2.3.6 and 3.2.1.5. Wetland buffers are an extremely important issue. Because of the fragility of wetland soil types, a concrete method for determining buffer areas is essential to make an informed decision concerning the approval of the proposed actions. 100:2

*The wetland crossing designs that are set forth in the document do not appear suitable to maintain natural water flows. Altered flows can have a considerable impact on wetland areas, like drying up some sections and not allowing others to drain freely. This may affect aquatic plants, forbs, and riparian vegetation that rely on particular water levels to live. Design criteria for crossings taking all of these factors into account need to be developed and documented, along with a complete discussion of impacts that each different design would have on the wetland systems. 100:3

*Conditions of the wetlands were not specified (i.e. degraded or pristine). These designations would have impact on wetland crossing site selection and possibly the buffer delineation. 100:4

*Agricultural lands need to be identified and qualified, rather than to say that they were interspersed and insignificant. Was the Soil Conservation Service consulted? 100:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Thomas Hale

100:1 Comment noted. See Section 2.6.2, 3.1.4.2, 3.3.4.2 new Figure 2-12, and responses to comments 3:5, 3:6, and 3:9.

100:2 The question of buffer width is examined in Section 3.3.1.5 of the Final EIS. Please also see response to comments 2:180, 3:15, and 3:16.

100:3 Comments are noted. Criteria suggested are those which are used to prepare crossing designs.

100:4 Comments noted. Exact crossing locations are not proposed in this phase of the study. As currently practiced, degraded areas, where they exist, are candidates for placement of improved crossings. Width of the wetland is also a criterion, the wider areas considered less desirable, assuming quality is equal.

100:5 Comment noted. No issues related to agricultural production were raised during the scoping process. Since no privately owned lands of any type are proposed to be converted to military use, there appears not to be any environmental impact issue related to agriculture.

Noise

- 100:6 *Noise impacts on nearby wilderness areas have not been sufficiently addressed. See 2.3.2.1. C-weighted and A-weighted noise levels need to be determined for all surrounding areas of Camp Shelby, where there are residences or recreation areas, to assess potential damage, annoyance levels, and loss of aesthetic quality or recreational experience.
- 100:7 *Specifically, the potential noise impacts of alternative one are not addressed. Alternative one greatly expands tank engagement areas and connective maneuver corridors in the southern portion of Camp Shelby, especially along the east side of highway 29. Though the net amount of activity would not increase, the location of maneuver exercises would. This needs to be considered with respect to bordering land uses around the perimeter of the camp and also along highway 29, which runs directly through it.
- 100:8 *There is alot of information presented on C-weighted noise and some of its implications, but not on the audible (A-weighted) noises. What impacts does the audible annoyance of vehicle movement, helicopters, and small-arms fire have on surrounding residential areas or on recreational uses?
- 100:9 *Physiological and/or psychological effects of the noise on humans (town of Grandee, sec. 2.3.2.1) needs to be included as an impact.
- 100:10 *Physical and/or design-oriented methods of mitigation should be presented for reducing the impact of C-weighted noise pollution. This should include examination of things like facility relocation and redesign, physical barriers, vegetation, etc.

Aesthetics/Cultural

- 100:11 *For the most part, visual appearances of the existing environment and the impacts that proposed actions will have on those resources is terribly neglected in this DEIS. Public perception is an important consideration and should be addressed. Repercussions in terms of social and economic impacts need to be explored and documented. Unique scenic features need to be identified and assessed.
- 100:12 Many respondents in the Mississippi SCORP (1985) indicated that there were a number of prevalent recreational pastimes enjoyed at Camp Shelby, including: hunting, camping, driving for pleasure, hiking, etc. These uses need to be addressed in terms of the scenic quality associated with each. The visual impacts, if any, could then be assessed to see if recreational uses would suffer.
- *A method for identifying and assessing scenic resources should be developed and documented, especially as it relates to recreational uses.

There were also some general concerns that I noted regarding the DEIS as a whole:

Administrative compliance

100:6 Comments noted. Considerable coverage has been added which addresses each of the issues raised here, including general Quality of Life for residents. See Sections 3.1.5, 3.3.3, 3.3.5, and 3.5.8.

100:7 See response to comment 100:6.

100:8 Both C and A-weighted noise are audible. The different scales are used for different purposes. See Appendix I and the response to comment 2:79.

100:9 See response to comments 100:6 and 100:8.

100:10 Comments noted. The problems associated with site selection are discussed, in part, in Section 1.3.1. Preparers note that vegetation is a relatively ineffective barrier to impulse noise, and that the lands between firing points and affected residences are almost totally forested in any case. Mitigation procedures are discussed in 3.2.4 and 3.4.11.

100:11 Comment noted. Your concerns are addressed in the new Quality of Life sections. See response to comment 100:6.

100:12 Impacts to aesthetics are discussed, by alternative, under Public Access in Section 3.3.3.4 of the Final EIS.

*An EIS must be prepared in an integrated interdisciplinary approach (a balanced combination of social and natural science expertise). The list of preparers for this DEIS is very heavy with natural science expertise, but leaves the social sciences lacking.

100:13

General document

*Some of the figures and tables are not very clear. Some examples include:
- Table 2-1. All use codes should have a separate column all the way across, allowing comparisons between training areas.

100:14

* Figs. 3-5 to 3-7, 3-13. Shading does not read well. Representing cleared areas as clear (i.e. reversing the shading) might be more legible.

100:15

- Maps, in general, need to have some surrounding points of reference (landmarks). They should not "float" in space.

*6th order headings should be avoided.

*Some excessive information exists, for example:

100:16

- Section 2.4.5.1.1. Remove sections on panther, wolf, and falcon.

- Section 2.5.3.1 could be summarized or put in an appendix.

100:17

- Sections 3.1.4.2 and 2.3.3.2 duplicate each other.

100:18

*Bias in the language exists throughout the document. This is especially apparent in Chapter 1 and in the Executive Summary. Phrases are couched to lean in favor of the preferred alternative. (e.g. "only such and such acreage").

100:19

I appreciate the opportunity to review this DEIS and hope these comments will be helpful in making the Final EIS comprehensive, accurate, and understandable.

Sincerely,


Thomas Hale

100:13 Comment noted. The proposed action(s) were identified through the scoping process as being heavily related to impacts to the biophysical environment, and the working group was developed to respond. Many members do have degrees and experience in areas such as psychology, sociology, archeology, regional planning, economics, and related social sciences.

100:14 Comment noted.

100:15 Comment noted. Graphics have been revised for the Final EIS.

100:16 Comment noted.

100:17 The level of coverage is related to the level of concern expressed in the scoping process (see Section 1.1.7.1).

100:18 Both sections treat mineral resources. Section 2 covers the present status of the environmental resource, while Section 3 treats the effects of military training on that resource. This results in topics being mentioned several times, but in a different context each time. This arrangement is discussed at some length in the introductions to Section 2.0 and Section 3.0 of the Final EIS.

100:19 Comment noted. Especially when describing why the proponent believes an action is necessary, and why present facilities are inadequate, some less than totally objective language may be used. Preparers believe that fewer examples of this are present in the Final EIS.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Marcus Hammack

14900 Highway 22
Bolton, MS 39041-9616
February 20, 1992

Mr. Thomas Craven
U. S. Corps of Engineers
Mobile District
Post Office Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven,

I would like to go on record objecting to expanded tank training in the De Soto National Forest, and specifically the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers' finding that the training would have "no significant impact." To say that tank training will have no significant impact on the fragile ecosystem is ludicrous, and further damages the Corps' reputation when it comes to environmental issues. At a time when the Corps seems intent on improving that reputation it reminds the public of the agency's historic environmental insensitivity.

The following is a list of specific impacts which I consider unacceptable:

- 101:1 The loss of large stands of irreplaceable timber
- 101:3 The potential for erosion and soil compaction in fragile valleys and in the watershed of the Black Creek Wild and Scenic River
- 101:4 Noise pollution in one of the finest natural areas remaining in the state of Mississippi
- 101:5 Loss of recreational access
- 101:6 Damage to critical habitat for endangered species including the gopher tortoise, black pine and indigo snakes, and red cockaded woodpecker.
- 101:7

I trust the Corps will address these concerns and reduce the chances of costly litigation.

Sincerely,

Marcus C. Hammack
Marcus C. Hammack

101:1 Comment noted.

101:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 17:5 and 21:3.

101:3 See response to comment 21:2.

101:4 See response to comments 10:5, 14:46 and 35:6.

101:5 See response to comment 21:4.

101:6 See additional coverage in Sections 3.3.3.4 and 3.5.11 of the Final EIS and the response to comment 21:8.

101:7 Critical habitat has not been defined by the US Fish and Wildlife Service for any of these species. Additional coverage has been included for these listed and sensitive species and for biodiversity as a whole in Sections 2.4.5 and 2.4.7 of the Final EIS.

101:8 Comment noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Wesley Hanks

102:1 Comment noted.

102:2 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 22.

102:3 Comment noted. Timber is considered a renewable resource and is not considered irreplaceable. Timber stands in this area are considered second growth, having originated in the 1930's. Please see the response to comment 30:2.

102:4 See response to comment 21:3.

102:5 Reasonable access to Forest Service administered lands will continue within safety restrictions. See additional coverage in Sections 3.3.3.4 and 3.5.11 of the Final EIS and the response to comment 21:8.

102:6 See response to comments 21:5, 21:8, 21:2 and 97:9. Please also see misconceptions 12 and 23.

102:7 See response to comment 21:7.

102:8 Please see added coverage in Section 1.1.2.3 of the Final EIS. Please also see response to comment 2:6.

102:9 Comment noted. Please see added coverage in Section 1.2.9 of the Final EIS. Please also see response to comment 2:31.

601 N. Hwy 61, Apt. 4G
Vicksburg, MS 39180
February 20, 1992

Thomas M. Craven
U. S. Army Corp of Engrs.
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile AL 36628-0001

Dear Sir,

I am opposed to expanded tank training in the Desoto National Forest. National Forest resources are very important to this country and they should be preserved and increased wherever possible. All of these lands should be available for public use as intended by the original National Forest acts.

This proposal involves cutting a large number of trees and damage to the forest ecosystem. In addition to the environmental damage, I'm very concerned that this would cut off a large portion of public lands from public use. This land was paid for and maintained by taxpayers for decades.

Also, forestry, forestry related jobs, and recreational use would be precluded. Eliminating taxes and income from these will increase the share of taxes I must pay. In addition, taxpayers pay the expenses for the National Guard or other government agencies to take over and use this land. That isn't desirable.

Since the Army is cutting back and tank production has been curtailed, I don't see any need for expanding training facilities at the expense of public use. Other areas are available for tank training. If you feel like you must have trees to run over, plant your own, don't try to take over ours.

Sincerely,

Wesley R. Hanks

Wesley R. Hanks

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Steve Hasty

103:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 5.

103:2 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 7 and 12.

Sir: I want to express my strong opposition to any expansion of Camp Shelby into Desoto National Forest & especially into Leaf River Wildlife Management Area. I vehemently oppose alternative #1 of your draft Environmental Impact Statement. If the National Guard insists on grabbing additional land, alternative #3B is the most palatable. Thanks for the opportunity to express my opinion.

Sincerely,

Steve Hasty
Steve Hasty

103:1

103:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Dan Hembree

104:1 Your concern is noted. Dust formation is discussed in Section 3.1.3 and abatement is examined in 3.2.4 and 3.4.11 of the Final EIS. Please also see response to comment 21:4.

104:2 See response to comment 21:6.

104:3 See response to comment 21:3.

104:4 See response to comments 21:4 and 104:1

104:5 Comment noted.

Feb. 21. 1992

Mobile District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers CESAM-PD-EE

Thomas M. Craven

P.O. Box 2288

Mobile, Al. 36618-0001

Dear Sir;

I live next to the Leake River Wildlife

Management Area. I try to operate a cattle

farm of 120 acre size. The farm is bordered on

the south and west by the management area. Of

this area is turned into a tank training area.

This farm operation will be hinder by noise

and dust. The quality of life I have enjoyed

here for 60 years will be decreased. Ecosystems of

many kinds will be damaged. Air and noise

pollution will effect our entire community.

There is much apathy in this community.

104:1

104:2

104:3

104:4

104:5

therefore you won't be getting letters about this matter but rest assured this community of "Progress" is against further extension of the tank-training area into the Wildlife area.

We the people here would like very much to talk to someone about this. We like about 3 or 4 miles west of McLean, Va.

Please consider alternative 3B.

Sincerely, a very
Concerned land owner,

Sam H. Kember
Ph. 753-2922

104:6 See response to comment 51:15.

104:7 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 7.

104:5

104:6

104:7

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Nona Herbert


105:1 Comment noted.

105:2 Comment noted.

105:3 Comment noted.

105:4 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:31 and misconception 16.

105:5 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 9.



Rt. 2 (Choctaw) Box 146

Shaw, Ms. 38773

2/24/1982

Thomas Creven

P.O. Box 2258

Mobile, Ala. 36628-0001

Dear Sir:

Please do not send me another set of books on Camp Shelby - I already have some.

I am again protesting the rape and pillage of Camp Shelby area to get some for tank maneuvers. Instead of firing on trees why don't you do the best you can with what you have until the depression is over.

Make a track through the trees and the western desert where there is lots of room and ideal conditions for the type of warfare the US will be getting into.

I do not believe there will ever be another used again in populated areas in France, Germany, etc.

I do not believe there will ever be another used again in populated areas in France, Germany, etc.

Please do not destroy the fossils.

Sincerely,
(Mrs G.) Nona Herbert

105:1

105:2

105:3

105:4

105:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
G.S. Hicks

106:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 5.

106:2 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 3:12 and misconception 9.

106:3 See response to comment 2:6. See general misconception statement 8.

Dear Sir:
I would like to take this opportunity to
oppose alternative #1 of the Environment
Impact Statement in the proposed Camp
Shelby land expansion. It seems to me
that this would expose an invaluable
large amount of the National Forest, which
now supports fish and wildlife, to such
training, which, short of a nuclear
weapons test facility, would have
upon the local environment with the
Gulf War over and defense needs lessening,
close absolutely no need for this
expansion.

Sincerely,
G. S. Hicks
8 Dogwood Hill Dr.
Tuckersville, TN 39244

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Merriane Hill

107:1 Comment noted.

107:2 Comment noted. Please see misconception 9.

107:3 See response to comment 2:6.

107:4 Comment noted.

Mobile District US Army
Corps of Engineers

Dear Mr. Cramer:

I am appalled at the National
Guard's proposal to use a large part of
what is now Leaf River Wild Life Management
Area for tank training. If we do not
face imminent attack, the destruction of
our land by the U.S. National Guard
appears more of a threat to our land than
does attack by an enemy. The
problems existing with the preparedness of
brigades from the Corps are not due to
lack of destruction of land by tanks but
to other causes, according to the GAO study.
I hope alternative #1 is rejected.

Yours sincerely,
Merriane Hill
Economist

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Jean Hilton

108:1 Comment noted.

108:2 Comment noted. Please see responses to 3:12, 10:5, 14:46 and 17:5.

108:3 See response to comment 21:5 and 21:8.

108:4 Comment noted.

108:1
Dear ~~Warden~~,
You very much against tanka interiors the
leaf reuse game management area. It would
cause massive side cutting to build roads
and tanka trails. The results of this would
cause enormous to create & Reiner and also
destroy the game habitat. also the loss
of a lot of forest related jobs and the
loss of recreational facilities to visitors.
I feel that the tanka maneuvers should
stay north of the Eight mile Road from
Hwy 29 to Beaumont.

108:2

108:3

108:4

Thank you kindly,
Jean Hilton
19406 Goni . Brooklyn Rd.
Brooklyn, m 39425



ROOFING AND CONSTRUCTION, INC.

Route 2, Box 170
Raleigh, MS 38153

JOE HOUSTON, Pres.
SHERI BREWER, Secy.-Treas.

January 10, 1992

Phone 601-788-5505
Fax 601-788-5500

JERRY HOUSTON, V.P.
JODY HOUSTON, V.P.

Mr. Trent Lott
U. S. Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Re: Camp Shelby

Dear Mr. Lott:

We support you one hundred percent regarding the land deal at Camp Shelby. 109:1

I believe the State of Mississippi needs all the benefits which will be received from the tank training facilities there. 109:2

While I can sympathize with those who do not want this operation in their backyard, I believe that it is in the best interest of the state to continue to support this project. As citizens, we are often asked to make allowances (such as highway rights-of-way) for the good of the state. 109:3

We're behind you!

Sincerely,

Joe Houston

Joe Houston

sb

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Joe Houston

109:1 Comment noted. The action proposed is the issuance of a Special Use Permit to use National Forest lands for military training. The area in question has been used for decades for training; it is only redesigned tracked vehicle maneuvers which would be new in those areas. Please see misconceptions 5 and 12.

109:2 Comment noted. Please see misconception 25.

109:3 Comment noted.

WE ARE THE PROFESSIONALS

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
T.L. and Chris Howell

T.L. and Chris Howell
1206 Estelle Ave.
Hattiesburg, MS. 39402
Feb. 20, 1992

110:1 Comment noted.

110:2 Comment noted.

To all U.S. Government Agencies and officials involved in or concerned with the new land use permit asked for by the Department of the Army and the Mississippi National Guard, for tank training in the Desoto National Forest and specifically the Leaf River wildlife Management Area:

We wish it to be known to all concerned that we are opposed to issuing a land use permit for tank training on any part of the Desoto National Forest lands south of road 303, known as the Eight mile Road, for the following reasons.

110:1

As has been stated, many times by Chris and me as well as other family members and land owners in the area, we wish to preserve our private land. Our land joins the proposed tank training area #2. (Perry County Sec. 31, TN-1-N, Range 9-W)

110:2

110:3 Comment noted. No acquisition of private property is associated with any alternative of the proposed action. Please also see response to comment 2:6.

110:4 Following comments such as yours, greatly expanded coverage of the Quality of Life of residents near the permit area has been included in the Final EIS.

First of all this is an old family home-stand (The J.M. Breland Place). The family withstood all the troop activity during and after world war II. They did not lose their land as many families in the area did, however there was constant troop and vehicle activity as well as gunfire on and around their home property. They didn't complain because they felt that it was their contribution to the war effort and training of soldiers after the war to help keep our country strong.

we do not want to see what our forefathers worked so hard to preserve destroyed unless it's for the preservation of our freedom and country. With the turn of events over the past few years, we feel that the expanded land use for tank training is not necessary at this time. we do not feel that we are under the threat of war in the near future.

There was not enough time spent on the human element in the Environmental Impact statement. we realize the affects of such training activity on wildlife is important, however,

110:3

110:4

110:4
People are far more important in
out opinion!

As a personal note, Chris and
I have worked approximately 40 years
for the right to enjoy the fruits
of our labor on the land during
our retirement years. I retired
Feb. 1, 1991.

110:5
we do not want to have to listen
to the additional noise of increased
support equipment activity, sitting, (I
believe the Army calls it pyrotechnics),
as well as the inconvenience of road
closings that may occur due to the
use of this area for tank training,
unless it is absolutely necessary.

110:6
So, we ask that the land use
permit for tank training be
issued for the area above road
303 only. we feel there is adequate
space in that area for the proper
tank training.

Sincerely,
J.L. and Chris Howell

110:5 Your concerns are addressed in Sections 3.1.3, 3.1.5, 3.2.4, 3.3.3, 3.3.5, and
3.4.11 of the Final EIS. See also the response to comments 2:244 and 2:339.

110:6 Comment noted.

110:7 See Section 3.3.5.2 of the Final EIS where it notes that no sensitive land uses are within the approach and takeoff zones of any of the proposed Tactical Aviation Areas. Overflight of private inholdings may occur at other times.

110:8 As provided in the Special Use Permit under clause 37, the National Guard is responsible for maintaining FS road 309 during the summer AT period and for any other damage which results from their use at other times of the year. Otherwise the Forest Service has maintenance responsibilities for this road.

110:9 This is mentioned in Section 3.4.11 of the Final EIS as an element which may be present in the new training areas and see Sections 2.3.2, 3.1.5, and 3.3.5 for noise issues. See also misconception 13.

110:10 See response to comment 14:36.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PREPARE FULLY	
Name: <u>TL and Chris Howell</u>	Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992
Address: <u>1206 Estelle St</u>	
City: <u>Hattiesburg</u>	State: <u>MS</u> Zip: <u></u>
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>3</u>	RESOURCE AREA:
<u>Who will maintain the US Forest Service</u> <u>road 309 where it will be used for maintenance</u> <u>support?</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>4</u>	RESOURCE AREA:
<u>Will private land be restricted from</u> <u>aerial overflights when tactical aviation</u> <u>units are training in the warner</u> <u>area. (On altitude basis - no low level flight)</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>5</u>	RESOURCE AREA:
<u>We would like to have a statement</u> <u>as to the cost of the EIS study &</u> <u>publication.</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
<u>We own property next to V&Z Training</u> <u>area Perry County Sec. 31. To 1-M; Range 9W</u> <u>what is going to be the affects of</u> <u>using Pyrotechnics near our land (noise)</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:

110:11 This effect has been analyzed in greater detail than in the Draft EIS, and appears in Section 3.3.5 of the Final EIS. See also misconception 21.

110:12 See response to comments 2:244 and 2:339, which focus on Highway 29, but the issues and policies presented apply to all public roads.

110:13 Comment noted. In response to requests such as yours, Alternatives 3A and 3B were developed and examined in both the Draft and Final EIS. Please also see misconception 19.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FIRMLY

Name: <u>W/H T.L. and CHRIS LUTWELL</u>	Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings
Address: <u>1206 Estelle St</u>	Hattiesburg, MS
City: <u>HATTIESBURG</u>	January 9, 1992
State: <u>MS</u>	
Zip: <u>39402</u>	

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>1</u>	RESOURCE AREA:
Since there is no buffer zone between private property and south of the warehouse considered we are concerned about the noise generated by warehouse training and don't feel that	

110:11

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>2</u>	RESOURCE AREA:
this was adequately discussed in EIS. All-around should have a buffer between them and private property to eliminate noise. Also feel that corridor at 3 is too close to private property	

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 3 RESOURCE AREA:

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>2</u>	RESOURCE AREA:
To what extent would road 309 be used during construction. How frequently (or with it) be blocked off and prevent access to my property	

110:12

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>1</u>	RESOURCE AREA:
8-mile Road - we would like to have the training zone restricted to the land north & north west of road 303 (mile road)	

110:13

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Alan Huffman

1056 Old Bridgeport Road
Bolton, MS 39041
February 20, 1992

Mr. Thomas Craven
U. S. Corps of Engineers
Mobile District
Post Office Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven,

I would like to go on record objecting to expanded tank training in the De Soto National Forest, and specifically the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers' finding that the training would have "no significant impact." To say that tank training will have no significant impact on the fragile ecosystem is ludicrous, and further damages the Corps' reputation when it comes to environmental issues. At a time when the Corps seems intent on improving that reputation it reminds the public of the agency's historic environmental insensitivity.

The following is a list of specific impacts which I consider unacceptable:

- The loss of large stands of irreplaceable timber 111:3
- The potential for erosion and soil compaction in fragile valleys and in the watershed of the Black Creek Wild and Scenic River 111:4
- Noise pollution in one of the finest natural areas remaining in the state of Mississippi 111:5
- Loss of recreational access 111:6
- Damage to critical habitat for endangered species including the gopher tortoise, black pine and indigo snakes, and red cockaded woodpecker. 111:7

I trust the Corps will address these concerns and reduce the chances of costly litigation. 111:8

Sincerely,


Alan Huffman

- 111:1 Comment noted.
- 111:2 See response to comment 101:2.
- 111:3 See response to comment 101:3.
- 111:4 See response to comment 101:4.
- 111:5 See response to comment 101:5.
- 111:6 See response to comment 101:6.
- 111:7 See response to comment 101:7.
- 111:8 See response to comment 101:8.

DAN C. HUGHES, JR.
INVESTMENT PROPERTIES

P.O. Box 1191
Jackson, Mississippi 39215
(601) 352-9372

February 20, 1992

Mr. Thomas M. Craven
U. S. Corps of Engineers
Post Office Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

RE: Land Grab - DeSoto National Forest

Dear Mr. Craven:


I'm writing to express my outrage over the proposed confiscation and destruction of thousands of acres of public timberland in DeSoto National Forest. As we both know, there is no imperative for this action. There must be other alternatives which would avoid such a massive impact on the environment and on the sensibilities of the local citizenry. .

What we have here is nothing more than the military (U. S. Army) impulsively confiscating the taxpayers' land (National Forest) and justifying same by a feasibility report (EIS) prepared by none other than the highly independent Corps of Engineers (also U. S. Army). This absurdity is laughable until one realizes that it may succeed.

Not incidentally, I'm a Director of the Mississippi Wildlife Federation which is the largest organization of sportsmen and conservationists in the State, representing some 25,000 Mississippians through its members and affiliates. Needless to say, the Federation has taken a public position opposing the land grab.

If you believe any Mississippians, other than a precious few who hope to further their financial self-interest, support this proposal, you are sadly mistaken.

Yours very truly,


Dan C. Hughes, Jr.

DCH:pgd

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Dan Hughes

112:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 9 and 12.

112:2 Comment noted. As discussed in Section 1.2.9 of the Final EIS, no other alternatives which are not of more serious consequences were identifiable which could meet the mission needs of the Army and the Mississippi National Guard. See also response to comments 2:31 and 2:310.

112:3 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 63:5.

112:4 Comment noted.

112:5 Comment noted.

Mr. Craven:

I am writing in response to the attached letter from the Mississippi Press. I have to thank the news on a daily basis. I have attended all the meetings from the initial force - "Land Swap" to the latest "we must grow bigger or die out on lands training" - as per US Rep. Gene Taylor said on a recent town meeting. In every meeting the only people who favored the expansion were the military members they brought to the meetings.

My opposition parallels that of my family & neighbors and that is we spent much money & expertise to develop our deer herd & the wild turkey in this beautiful forest. There are many other wildlife to be considered such as the latest bear sightings and the necessary land required to enhance their continued survival.

113:1 Comment noted.

113:2 Comment noted. Please also see the response to comment 21:3.

113:1

113:2

113:3 See response to comment 2:6. See general misconception statements 5 and 8.

113:4 Comment Noted. See additional coverage on the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area (Sections 3.3.6 and 3.5.12). Your concern for effects on other wildlife management areas is incorporated in Section 3.5.5 of the Final EIS.

113:5 See response to comment 2:31 and misconception 16.

113:3

If the Nation's Defense warranted this expansion of the area for it. But in this time of peace even it just doesn't make sense to enlarge tank training in a forestry setting. Particularly when we just finished a desert war & had to send people to the west to get desert training.

Since most of us hunt & camp in the area - loads of my amount of the recreation areas will cause the Red Creek & adjacent areas to become more crowded and lower the quality of life for much of south Mississippi.

Recommend the tanks train out west in the desert areas. Thank you

Henry S. Humphrey

Letter to the Editor (Mississippi Press)
Attached to this letter not reproduced
in this FEIS.

113:5

113:4

March 23, 1992

114:1 Comment noted.

114:2 Comment noted. Please also see general misconception statement 5.

114:3 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 2:6.

114:4 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 3:12 and 17:5 and misconceptions 9 and 17.

Dear Mr. Craven,

I have been reading about the tank battalion training area that is being proposed for Camp Shelby. During this past year I have not written and voiced an opinion because I felt that surely common sense would prevail. However, just in case it doesn't I wanted to respond -

The forest land does not need to be cleared - Camp Shelby does not need to be enlarged. By now taxpayer money is to be spent it does not need to be for this National Guard project -

Please leave the forests as they are - We need the trees.

114:1

114:2

114:3

114:4

Sincerely,
Rosemary Hyde
522 Owen Dr.
Carmichael, Niles -

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
H. Edwin Jackson

91 JAN REC'D

1904 Evergreen Lane
Hattiesburg, Ms. 39401

27 January, 1992

Mr. Thomas M. Craven, CESAM-PD-EI
Corps of Engineers, Mobile District
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

I take this opportunity to comment on the draft environmental impact statement "Military Training Use of National Forest Lands, Camp Shelby". Specifically, I would like to address Section 2.5.3--Archeological and Historical Resources.

I. Scope of Study:

I am disappointed to find that the opportunity to generate, by systematic survey of the study area, the necessary database for constructing models of prehistoric use of the Mississippi Piney Woods region (and therefore an informed basis for cultural resource management decisions) was avoided. Moreover, information provided by the report prevents an adequate assessment of just what the scope of the study was.

II. Background

The literature review (2.5.3.1) consists mainly of a verbatim excerpt from a 1983 report by Forest Service archaeologist DeLeon. No attempt was made to integrate more recent studies of the coastal plain in Mississippi and adjacent states. Other opinions regarding the state of regional archaeology are not included. For instance, Heisler and Padgett (1979) suggested that "we cannot at this time say where significant prehistoric sites will be located, and Blitz (1984) concluded that "in the case of southeastern Mississippi there is a relatively complete consensus that not much is known". From this perspective, a more, rather than less, comprehensive study seems to have been warranted.

Moreover, the introduction to the section is misleading, by presenting DeLeon's study as being of the "new tank maneuver area at Camp Shelby". The reader might be led to conclude that what was considered in DeLeon's report are the maneuver area possibilities under consideration in the present report. However, it includes only the northern portion of Camp Shelby, not the area designated as the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area.

Finally, DeLeon's survey report, on which the present management rationale is based, is inadequate. No information is

115:1 Comment noted. See response to comments 10:8 and 10:9.

115:2 DeLeon's report was considered in light of additional survey work conducted by the Forest Service and the Mobile District in the late 1980s. In addition, the Camp Shelby survey strategies were developed in consultation with archeologists from Mississippi SHPOs office who have experience and knowledge of the expected resources within Camp Shelby. A prime factor in survey strategies at Camp Shelby was past land use its effect on historic resources. Past land use such as farming, silva culture and military training triggered severe erosion which have effected site integrity.

115:3 The wording of the text in Section 2.5.3.1 of the Final EIS has been clarified.

115:4 The text in Section 2.5.3.2 of the Draft and Final EIS indicate that more than 10,000 acres were shovel tested in a series of studies by many entities in the years following DeLeon's report.

115:1

115:2

115:3

115:4

115:5 Comment noted. See response to comments 115:2, 10:8 and 10:9.

115:6 The information upon which Table 2-6 of the DEIS (Table 2-7 in the FEIS) was based on survey reports submitted to the Mississippi State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). These reports are available from that office. Specific survey strategy is presented in the Historic Preservation Plan. It is the opinion of both the office of the SHPO and the Corps of Engineers cultural resource specialists that all survey work conducted at Camp Shelby conforms to the guidelines recommended by the Mississippi SHPO.

115:7 Low probability sites were not ignored. They were covered in the development of survey strategies. By virtue of walking from one High Probability to another, low probability areas were inspected. No sites were identified within these areas. The survey strategy contained within the Historic Preservation Plan was faithfully followed.

115:8 All registered historic cemeteries are currently fenced and protected, and are not endangered by the proposed action. Prior to implementation of any alternative, cultural resources surveys will be conducted as a part of the site analysis process (Section 1.4 of the Final EIS). These will identify previously unknown cemeteries as well as pre-settlement sites.

115:9 All survey reports are submitted to the Mississippi State Historic Preservation Officer with appropriate site information marked on USGS 1:24,000 quadrangle maps. These reports are available from the Mississippi SHPO. Inclusion of every site map at a meaningful scale is believed impractical in this document.

included in it that would allow for evaluation of the intensity and completeness of his survey. It apparently did not rely on shovel testing (currently part of the revised Historic Preservation Plan (Memorandum for the Record, April 12, 1990, referenced in Giliberti 1990). Thus, as Giliberti (1990) stated, site distributions identified by DeLeon may be of easiest-to-find sites rather than a sample of the universe of existing sites.

III. Historic Preservation Plan

Inadequate information is presented to evaluate section 2.5.3.2. Other than to note a prehistoric preference for "sites to be located at ridge locations at the headwaters of branch or drain" no clear criteria for differentiating areas of differing site potential is presented. This generality is augmented by the "collective professional experience" of Historic Preservation Plan developers, but what is added by this additional expertise is not clear, other than to agree that the archaeology is either too disturbed or too uninteresting to warrant adequate investigation. It should be noted that Daleon's site location modeling is very limited in scope. As a case in point, recent work on the Gulf coastal plain in western Alabama has found a tendency for sites, including Early Archaic components, to occur on high ridges (Noel R. Stowe, personal communication).

IV. Fieldwork Substantiating HPP

Insufficient information is presented to evaluate the "additional" fieldwork conducted by COE archaeologists. Quite impressive summary statistics are presented in Table 2-6. These cannot be evaluated since in addition to the absence of probability criteria, there is no information about survey intensity, shovel test intervals, or other data deemed necessary by the SHPO (MDAH CRM report requirements). According to my own survey experience an adequate high intensity survey of 4300 acres require approximately 170 person days to complete; MDAH guidelines suggest a minimum of 87 person days.

Moreover, the site location predictive model is not evaluated since low probability areas are largely ignored in the most recent field efforts.

V. Additional Comments

The report fails to address historic resources outside of the cantonment area, in particular, historic cemeteries. Where are recorded cemeteries with reference to proposed maneuver and construction areas?

The lack of maps or diagrams preclude independent assessment of high probability areas, high disturbance areas, actual survey areas.


The only redeeming aspect of the CRM report is that

115:10 Commentor is correct. Cultural resources surveys will be performed prior to the timber harvest. Please also see response to comment 115:8. In times of diminishing funding, preparers believe that survey of areas proposed to be modified must take priority over generalized areawide surveys, especially in low-probability areas.

additional survey will be required "prior to ground disturbing activities on Forest Service lands", according to Clause 47 of the Special Use Permit. Clear cutting and tracked vehicle maneuvering, as well as specific construction projects, are ground disturbing activities. Minimally, survey should be required of all projects in low and moderate disturbance zones, particularly in the southeastern portion of Camp Shelby. Such a piecemeal approach is likely to hinder the potential contribution that the Camp Shelby region could make to understanding the prehistory of south Mississippi, particularly as long as present "models" for site location are stressed at the expense of intensive, systematic survey. However, at least a portion of the available data has some chance of being collected.

115:10

Respectfully,


Edwin Jackson, Ph.D.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Lawrence Johnson

116:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 5 and 12.

116:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 2:6 and 35:12 and misconception 8.

116:3 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 116:2.

608 Concert Street
Hattiesburg, MS 39401
February 6, 1992

Thomas M. Craven
Corps of Engineers
Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628

Dear Mr. Craven:

This is to let you know that my family and I are completely opposed to the proposed land acquisition by the Mississippi National Guard at Camp Shelby.


116:1

We see no need for tanks to tear up our trees and land and spoil and pollute our national forest. A great many other local residents feel the same way and we hope you will take our concerns into consideration. The cold war is over and we do not need extra tank training areas. The environment is much more important. Thank you.

116:2

116:3

Sincerely yours,



Lawrence E. Johnson

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Stewart Kallam

February 21, 1992

Thomas M. Cravens
U.S. Army Corp fo Engineering
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Cravens:

I would like to make you aware that I am opposed to expanding the tank training area at Camp Shelby onto the Desoto National Forest. Being dependent on the timber industry for my livelihood, my foremost concern is the destruction of productive timberland and the possible loss of forestry related jobs. It would appear very insensible to destroy timber production, increase noise pollution, jeopardize recreational opportunities and diminish the quality of life for nearby residents for the sake of expanding training grounds for the discontinued M-1 tank.

Please take these concerns into consideration when determining the final use of this land.

Sincerely,



Stewart L. Kallam
Route 5, Box 163-K
Tylertown, MS 39667

117:1

117:2

117:3

117:1 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 5.

117:2 Comment noted. See response to comments 21:2, 21:5, 63:29 and 82:4 and misconception 9.

117:3 See response to comments 21:2, 21:4, 21:7, 21:6, 21:8.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Susan Keith

512 Greensboro Street
Starkville, MS 39759
February 19, 1992

Thomas M. Craven
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am writing to voice my opposition to expanded tank training in the DeSoto National Forest. In a time of peace in our country it seems ludicrous to endanger humans and animals for the purpose of military training. I fail to see that there is any positive outcome in this destruction of forest land.

DeSoto National Forest provides a home for wildlife, funds for schools and roads, and recreational facilities. Destruction of this land would damage fragile ecosystems, loss of forestry and forest-related jobs, diminished quality of life, loss of recreational facilities to visitors to our state and loss of timber revenues from massive clear-cutting.

Please do not allow this terrible destruction to occur in Mississippi.

Sincerely,

Susan D. Keith

Susan D. Keith

- 118:1 Comment noted.
- 118:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6.
- 118:3 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 9.
- 118:4 Comment noted.
- 118:5 See response to comment 21:3 and misconception 17.
- 118:6 See response to comment 21:5.
- 118:7 See response to comment 21:6.
- 118:8 See response to comment 21:8.
- 118:9 See response to comment 21:2.
- 118:10 Comment noted. Please see misconception 17.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Florence Koopman

Florence Koopman
108 Ramoneda St.,
Bay St. Louis, MS
39520

February 24, 1992

Mr Tom Craven
Department of the Army,
Corps of Engineers, Mobile Dist.
Inland Environmental Section
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Sir:

I am not a member of major clubs or organizations. I adamantly oppose the "takeover" of a wildlife Management Area by a Tank-Training National Guard. This "takeover" would be a technological blunder and increasingly more embarrassing to those that become more familiar with the results.

Do not blame unreadiness for the desert duty (Desert Storm) on the lack of forest training! This does not make sense.

The National Guard is threatening us with "pulling out" if they do not get their way. Their exit could result in more people becoming involved with jobs regarding good forestry practices and other environmental protection, and enhancement of tourism and increase in the recreation businesses.

It is so obvious that tanks are history like a caveman with a club compared to todays air and rocket power.

So "they" wanted 16,000 acres of Colorado Grassland--- now they want 116,000 acres of Mississippi forests in a Wildlife Management Area. It is perplexing as to any reason for the need and why "they" want to smash any of our precious Wildlife Occupied Areas any where!

Sincerely,
Mrs Florence Koopman

119:1

119:2

119:3

119:4

119:5

119:6

119:1 Comment noted. Please see misconceptions 5 and 23.

119:2 Comment noted.

119:3 See response to comment 2:6.

119:4 Comment noted.

119:5 Comment noted. See response to comments 21:7 and 53:4.

119:6 Comment noted. The 16,000 acres in Colorado was a small part of a much larger area already purchased by the Army for maneuvers. The smaller area was not suitable for maneuver use, and was never used, but was required to be purchased as a part of a larger parcel of land. Because of its extreme sensitivity and archeological richness, it has been transferred to National Forest management, and may be a potential National Monument. Please see Section 1.1.4 of the Final EIS.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Frank Koopman

Frank Koopman
108 Ramoneda St.
Bay St. Louis, MS
39520

February 28, 1992

Senator Trent Lott
115 Russell Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Congressman,

Please do not support the activity to increase the amount of area for use in military-tank-training-operations here in our Mississippi.

We should not trade the precious realstate that exist there today for what it will become. The enclosed contains my thoughts about this problem. I hoped that it could be ignored and the request would go away! We should think about the consequences of such a operation.

Thank you for your considerations.


Frank Koopman

120:1 Comment noted.

120:2 Comment noted. Please see misconception 12.

120:1

120:2

120:3 Comment noted.

120:4 See response to comment 74:2. See general misconception statement 9.

120:5 See additional coverage in Section 3.3.3.4. and response to comment 21:8.

120:6 Comment noted. See response to comment 21:5 and general misconception statement 9.

Frank Koopman
108 Ramoneda
Bay St. Louis, MS
39520

February 28, 1992

Mr Tom Craven
Depart of the Army,
Corps of Engineers, Mobile Dist.
Inland Environmental Section
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Sir,

I do not believe that "the surrendering" under consideration of additional area to the Military for tank-training purposes is in the best interest for Mississippi. This action will probably seriously decrease the value of the land for future generations.

If tanks are used over the terrain - the change would be costly and there would be practically no recreational value. Within a few years there would not be any revenue generated (direct or indirect) from the area and the remains may be worthless for several generations.

Hope you can take some time from your busy schedule to glance at the attached page. It is my version, as a layman, to discuss the aspects of increasing the size of the area for training and the overall value of the use of tanks today.

Sincerely,

Frank Koopman
Frank Koopman

120:3

120:4

120:5

120:6

P. T. Kulick, P.E.
13713 Windle Circle
Ocean Springs, Mississippi 39564

Mobile District US Army Corps of Engineers March 11, 1992
Attn: Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Gentlemen:

I want to voice my strong opposition to destroying more of the De Soto National Forest and particularly the Leaf River Wilderness area with National Guard Tank maneuvers & training. If a compromise is necessary, it would support 3B alternative in the Environmental Impact Statement for Campobello.

It appears that the whole idea of tank training is obsolete and certainly other closed down bases could be used on a temporary basis until the Dept. of Defense acknowledges the fact.

Very truly yours,
Patricia T. Kulick,
P.E.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Patricia Kulick

121:1 Comment noted. Please refer to Misconceptions 9 and 14 and response to Comment 16:2. The commentor may be confusing the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area with the Leaf Wilderness. The Leaf Wilderness is located near the town of Leaf, Mississippi, three miles east of the eastern boundary of the LRWMA. Although it is also a part of the De Soto National Forest, it is not within the present or proposed Special Use Permit area, and there are no plans to utilize the Leaf Wilderness for any purpose.

121:2 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 7.

121:3 See responses to comments 2:6, 2:31, 21:7 and 53:4.

121:1

121:2

121:3

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
W.D. Langenwaller

2-27-92

Sir Thomas Curran,
Please say our
national forest at
Camp Shelby. We are
now at peace and
need timber resources
as well as wild life
habitat.

122:1

122:1 Comment noted.

122:2

122:2 Comment noted.

Sincerely,
W.D. Langenwaller

W. D. Langenwaller
52 - 54th Street
Gulfport, MS 39507

P. O. Box 290
Gautier, MS 39553

February 21, 1992

Thomas M. Craven
Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Thomas M. Craven:

It is one of the biggest mistakes in Mississippi's recent history to allow the National Guard to freely abuse Leaf River Game Management Area.

Our timber lands--forests and tree farms--are the main filtration system that protects the Mississippi Sound and its seafood nursery. Our seafood industry will be further jeopardized if the National Guard is allowed to destroy more of the land that should be preserved for future generations of Mississippians and other Americans. After all, this land is part of a National Forest.

Lumber jobs will be permanently lost as a result of the clearing of the land, whereas continued sustainable cutting would preserve more trees and jobs.

Erosion will result on a massive scale and will be difficult to repair as long as tanks return year after year.

People who live in the area will suffer increased noise pollution and decreased hunting habitat.

The threat to endangered species is of special concern. Besides the flippancy dismissal of endangerment to gopher tortoises and red-cockaded woodpeckers, I am under the impression that no data has been compiled about the probable threat this development has on the future of the Gulf of Mexico Sturgeon which breeds somewhere in the Pascagoula/Leaf/Chicasawhay/Black Creek/Red Creek River system.

Until a thorough study is undertaken which determines the breeding site or sites of the Gulf of Mexico Sturgeon, the tank field should not be opened up anywhere near the Leaf River or Black Creek or Black Creek's tributaries.

Sturgeons must have relatively clear bottom on which to deposit eggs. There is evidence to suggest that if a breeding area becomes unsuitable, the population of sturgeons will become extinct rather than find another suitable location. The M-1-A tanks will likely contribute siltation to the nearby waterways and do most of this damage in the summer time when sturgeons breed.

To Mississippians (if there are any) who support the Land Steal I would say: You ought to be ashamed of yourselves for going along with this harmful and useless plan. The Pentagon--if left alone--might close down Camp Shelby entirely as a money-saving option that would help us control our national debt. Instead, because of political pressures to provide a "military welfare or subsidy system" to the Hattiesburg area, individuals such as yourselves choose to pretend that no damage will occur and this tank field is a military necessity. Future generations of Mississippians will curse all who chose to sell out our most important resources. Your name may be forgotten but your crime will live on as an ugly scar. While great men and women leave monuments behind, you will leave a holocaust in Mississippi's formerly beautiful forest.

Sincerely,



Dr. Jeanne Lebow

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Jeanne Lebow

123:1 Comment noted. Please see misconception 14.

123:2 Preparers note that, in a comment prepared by the Coastal Management Branch of the Bureau of Marine Resources, no significant impact on coastal resources is seen as resulting from the proposed action (Comment 4:1). Please also see responses to comments 4:2, 7:4, 7:24, 10:5, and 14:46.

123:3 See response to comment 21:5.

123:4 Please see response to comment 123:2.

123:5 Please see Section 3.3.3.4 of the Final EIS and the responses to comments 21:4 and 21:6 and misconceptions 4 and 21.

123:6 The 1992 and 1993 Biological Opinions from the USFWS on the Gopher Tortoise both indicate that neither the past nor proposed actions (except Alternative 3B) are likely to adversely effect the survival of the species. See response to comments 1:4 and 1:33. The decline of the red-cockaded woodpecker throughout the De Soto National Forest is general, and does not appear to be related to Camp Shelby activities. See response to comments 1:2, 14:22, and 14:24. Sections 2.4.5.1.2 and 3.5.6 of the Final EIS have been expanded to discuss the Gulf sturgeon and potential effects of existing and proposed training activities on this species. Based on present understanding of the sturgeon's habitat preference for deep holes and spring discharges in larger streams, we do not project any direct adverse effects to the sturgeon.

123:7 See response to comment 123:6.

123:8 Comment noted. See response to comment 123:6. The issue of minimization of soil loss has been a major focus of both the Draft and Final EIS. See responses to Comments 10:5 and 14:46.

123:9 Comment noted.

123:10 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 25.

123:11 Comment noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Donna Lee

Feb 20, 1992

M. Thomas Crover
Corps of Engineers
Mobile Ala

Sir.

This is to advise you
I oppose the take over
of former lands by the Army
& Comp Shelby.
The loss of timber (milled in
trees from shells) even if cut
cannot be sold. This has
been a revenue for schools
on wood cut in the past.
I am a person who

I am a person - it would
love the nature for the
be a disaster for the
wild life in that area

124:1 Comment noted. Please see misconceptions 5 and 23.

124:2 There is no firing to occur in the proposed tank maneuver areas. Therefore, there should be no increased metal damage to timber in maneuver areas as a result of implementing any of these alternatives. The only metal which would occur is in trees within the existing firing ranges. The proposed projects for up-grading and constructing ranges are located near present ranges. Trees which already have metal damage wouldn't be utilized because of the potential for damage to mill equipment and personnel. Those without damage would be sold. The proposed maneuver area development would have no effect on the presence of bullet damaged timber. See coverage in Section 3.3.4.3.1 for additional discussion of impacts to county returns from implementing the various alternatives.

124:3 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 21:3 and misconception 14.

124:1

124:2

124:3

124:4 Please see response to comments 2:339, 21:4 and 21:6.

124:5 Comment noted.

2.
The people who live
near there are already
complaining of noise &
excess traffic on rural
roads.
With the reduction of
US Army, Navy & Air Force I
feel cut backs should be
made in all areas -

Sincerely,
Samuel Lee

581 Leeville Rd
Ft. Belvoir MS 38945-

124:4

124:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
James Lee

125:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 5 and 9.

125:2 A study has been conducted for this purpose. See Appendix K of the Final EIS and the response to comment 2:6.

125:3 See response to comment 2:31.

125:1

125:2

125:3

125:2

125:3

20 Feb 1972

Dear Sir,

I am writing to oppose the Camp Shelby expansion into and destroying the rest of our National Forest.

First the Military has not had a study to determine that they need the land for tank training. Is there any other area in the U.S. that already has that type of land area already in use? Our politicians and military has refused to request a General Accounting office to determine a need of the land. With the Military Cut back sword think the California and

125:4 See response to comments 21:2, 21:5.

125:5 No changes are proposed in impact area designation, and no new areas will be contaminated with ordnance in any alternative. Please also see response to comment 2:6 and general misconception statements 2, 9, and 13.

125:3

and Fort Hood facilities would
be more than adequate and
sufficient for that use.

Secondly, the Fort Hood lands
provide jobs and income for
many people in this area, also
income from timber sales
in a Red stand reserves

125:4

what happens when the
timber is destroyed and
land contaminated with
explosives, (live and inert) and
the defense priority changes. We
will not have the timber
lands for income nor the
ground at Shelby.

125:5

also the area is the
habitat of the tortoise turtle
that is endangered, the
piny woodpecker black male, the
cockaded woodpecker and woodpe
cker. this military tank
training is certainly going
to interfere with these
species of the National
Forest.

I request that you oppose
the National Guard request
to expand into the National
Forest any further. of the
politicians and military people
would look past the end

125:6 See response to comment number 26:2 regarding your concern for T&E
species. The eastern woodrat (*Neotoma floridana*), however, is not a listed species in
Mississippi, but is afforded the same protection given to other non-game wildlife. See
Sections 2.4.5, 3.1.2.5, 3.3.2.5, and 3.5.6 of the Final EIS.

125:7 Comment noted.

125:6

125:1

125:7

of their money they would
see that this is a
terrible price to pay for a
short sighted attempt to
further their careers and
wote getting action by these
people.

Please stop this kind
steal.

Jama D. Lee

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Justin Lee

23 Feb 1992

Dear Sir,

I am writing in opposition
to the Camp Shelby application
into the Leaf River Wildlife
refuge.

I am concerned about the
damage that will be done to
the habitat of the endangered
Tortoise Turtles, Cackal
woodpeckers and perhaps
Black snake.

I am also against cutting of
all that timber that now
provides income for the
surrounding community. After
tank training that ends

126:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 5 and 6.

126:2 Comment noted. See response to comments 1:2 and 26:2.

126:3 Comment noted. Please see additional coverage in Sections 3.3.2.3.1 and
3.3.4.3.1 for an explanation of why timber sales, and by association revenues,
shouldn't be reduced from present. They just won't increase as much. Please also see
response to comments 21:2 and 92:6.

126:1

126:2

126:3

126:3

All income from timber
in these areas.

I use the desert Farall
for recreation, horse
back riding, fishing, camping
and hunting. The Guard
operation will severely
curtail these activities.

126:4

126:5

I urge you not to let
timber into any area
south of Beaumont & Black
top road. Alternative
3 B would suffice for
the Natural Grade

126:5

Need.
With the cutbacks
that are sure to come
I see no need and
strongly oppose any further
land tracing south of
Beaumont Black Top road.

126:6

Sincerely
Justin Lee
590 Leaville Road
Petrol, MS 39465

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Robert E. Lee

Army Corps of Engineers
Mobile District
CESAM-FD-EI
Attn: Thomas Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

February 26, 1992


Mr. Craven:

I am writing with reference to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) concerning the Leaf River Management Area. I believe the present EIS does not adequately address the subject of soil erosion in the areas of tank trails and maneuver areas. I have seen the present erosion prevention techniques used at Camp Shelby and find them to be substandard. If those same techniques are used in the ridges and around the streams and tributaries in the Leaf River, massive amounts of soil will be displaced to the detriment of the environment.

I also believe the EIS does not address oil deposition from the tanks in the maneuver areas or the assembly areas. Too much oil will be deposited in the assembly area for it to remain in reclaimable condition.

Finally, I believe the EIS does not adequately address the shift in animal populations due to the clear-cutting and thinning of the forest. It also does not address the impact on adjacent areas of the DeSoto National Forest from a standpoint of animal over-grazing or the dramatic increase in hunting pressure due to the loss of habitat in the Leaf River Management Area. It also does not address the increase in hunter proximity from a safety standpoint with the loss of so much suitable habitat.

Please take necessary action to see these areas are addressed.


ROBERT E. LEE
2039 North Drive
Biloxi, MS 39531

127:1 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 10:5 and 14:46.

127:2 See response to comment 20:5.

127:3 See response to comments 1:9, 1:11, and 2:132.

127:4 Comment noted. Hunting pressure and habitat utilization on adjacent areas may increase temporarily for some species as a result of the clearing and thinning operations in LRWMA that will proceed over a four year period. Access to the LRWMA will continue under the proposed training plans. Restricted access will apply to portions of the LRWMA during seasonal training periods as is the case with existing training areas in the De Soto National Forest at Camp Shelby. The LRWMA will remain open and accessible during hunting seasons. Please refer to response to comments 89:3 and 113:4.

127:5 Comment noted. Habitat alterations due to timber clearing and thinning in the LRWMA will proceed over a four year period. The length of this period should allow hunters and others that utilize the LRWMA to adjust to the changes. The increased visibility has the potential to improve safety if appropriate game laws, including requirements for high-visibility clothing, are followed. Please refer to response to Comment 127:4.

127:1

127:2

127:3

127:4

127:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Tina Lipscomb

Lipscomb, Tina
Feb. 26, 1952

Thomas M. Chasen
Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Ala. 36628-0001

Dear Sir:

This letter is written regarding the
U.S. National Forest. This area provides
yearly funds for our school and trade, recreational
facilities, natural beauty, and resources for
thousands of visitors every year.

It is inconceivable that we can even
consider letting expanded tank training take
place in this area. The forest will be damaged,
wildlife management taken over by "M.I. Tanks",
fragile ecosystems, which involve protected plants
and animals, will be damaged.

There has been no established mission or need
for the proposed tank training. It is my earnest
wish and my prayer that this proposal not
be accepted.

Sincerely,
Tina Lipscomb
208 45th St.
Burlington, N.C.

128:1

128:2

128:3

128:4

128:5

128:1 Comment noted.

128:2 Comment noted.

128:3 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 3:12 and 17:5 and
misconception 9.

128:4 See response to comments 21:3 and 26:2.

128:5 See response to comment 2:6.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Louise Love

129:1 Comment noted. Please see general misconceptions 12 and 23.

129:2 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 21:7 and 53:4.

306 Leland Avenue
Troy, N.Y. 12180
February 19, 1942

Mr. Thomas M. Craven
U.S. Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001

Dear Sir:

Please remember me among those who are adamantly opposed to the take-over of thousands of acres of the State National Forest to be used for tank training. It is unthinkable that the State of Minnesota, the greatest state in the Union, should be robbed of its God-given natural resources for training in the operation of tanks that will most likely be obsolete before they are used.

Yours Truly
Louise Love

129:1

129:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Allen Lowrie

130:1 Comment noted.

130:2 Please see Section 1.1.2.3 of the Final EIS, and the response to comment 2:6.

130:3 Comment noted. Please also see Appendix K, the response to comment 2:6, and general misconception statement number 5.

Allen Lowrie
230 FZ Goss Road
Piquette, MS 39466-9707
17 January 1992

Tom Craven
Dept of the Army, Mobile District
Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am against extending the area open for tank maneuvers in the Black Creek Range District of the De Soto National Forest. The present 14,000 acre range has been plenty for the duration of the Cold War. What do we need additional area for? I believe in a strong military, one well trained and ready to fight anywhere as in Desert Storm, but existing facilities are indeed ample. Please do not extend tank training area.

Sincerely
Allen Lowrie

130:1

130:2

130:3



Leaseway
Customized Transport, Inc.
A Highway Center Company of
Leaseway Transportation Corp.
P.O. Box 1010
Florence, Mississippi 39073
601-845-3634

Dear Mr. Craven,

Please don't destroy our trees, and multiple around
Camp Shelby. I have never got to visit the area, and would
love to in the future. As I have many of our friends. As the
saying goes, the best thing is in life are free, seeing
beautiful birds and woods in this day & time is like the next
best thing to heaven.

Other Reasons Are:

Loss of timber revenues from massive clear-cutting.
Damage to fragile ecosystems which include protected
Animals & Plants.
Loss of forestry
Loss of recreational facilities to visitors.

Faye B. Mahaffey
Just a very concerned citizen

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Faye Mahaffey

131:1 Comment noted.

131:2 See responses to comments 21:2 and 92:6.

131:3 See response to comment 21:3.

131:4 See additional coverage in Sections 3.3.2.3 and 3.3.4.3 and response to
comment 21:5.

131:5 See response to comment 21:8.

131:1

131:2

131:3

131:4

131:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Louise and Edward Maslowski

Feb. 25, 1992
30-51st Street
Gulfport, MS 39507

Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven,

We are in opposition to the expanded tank training for the following reasons:

1-Damaga.to the fragile ecosystems which involve protected animals and plants.

2- Noise pollution which has not been adequately studied.

3-No established mission or need since the military has been reduced.

4- Loss of timber revenues from massive clear cutting.

5- Loss of recreational facilities to visitors across the country.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Louise P. Maslowski
Louise P. Maslowski
Edward W. Maslowski
Edward W. Maslowski

- 132:1 See response to comment 21:3.
132:2 See response to comment 21:4.
132:3 See response to comment 2:6 and misconception 8.
132:4 See response to comment 21:2.
132:5 See response to comment 21:8.

132:1

132:2

132:3

132:4

132:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Betty Mason

133:1 Comment noted. Please see misconceptions 6, 9, 14, and 17.

133:2 This issue is treated in Section 3.1.1.3.5 and 3.2.2.3 of the Final EIS. Fuel is delivered to Camp Shelby bulk storage facility by commercial haulers. Fuel is then hauled by tactical fuel trucks from Camp Shelby bulk fuel site to training areas using designated tank trails and other training area road networks. The increase of fuel delivery to Camp Shelby should not affect the present highway system. This increase will actually be an economic boost to the commercial vendors who contract fuel for Camp Shelby.

133:3 See response to comment 133:2.

133:4 The concern of fugitive dust has been added to the new Quality of Life coverage in the Final EIS. See also the response to comment 104:1.

133:5 Helicopter activity should not increase overall at Camp Shelby. Flight paths may change and some areas may increase while others decrease. Selection of sites for aviation training and any maneuver site selection will consolidate helicopter activity in that area. The Air-to-Ground Range noise is associated with high performance jet aircraft and not helicopters. Noise data will be collected and problems will be addressed for solution in the ICUZ SOP for Camp Shelby. Also see response to comments 21:4, 51:11.

133:6 No permanent fuel storage sites are now or will be located within the air to ground range fan.

133:7 The Administrative Order issued by the Mississippi Commission on Environmental Quality concerning the Open Burning/Open Detonation (OB/OD) Facility located within the Impact Area is contained at Appendix D of the EIS, pages D1-D4. This order did not require closure of the Camp Shelby impact area. See also the response to comment 2:33, and misconception 5.

133:8 No changes in ground water quality or quantity are seen as a result of any proposed action.

133:9 The water at the commentator's location should be less turbid in the future for two reasons. First, stream and wetland buffers will be applied to these stream drainages in any case. Secondly, much less maneuver use will take place in the watershed if the preferred alternative is adopted. See Section 3.2.2.3 of the Final EIS and response to comments 10:5 and 14:46.

133:10 See response to comments 20:5 and 35:6.

Response to comment 133:11 is on the following page

2-23-92

The following is a list of my objections to the DeSoto National Forest being given to the Department of Defense.

First my general comment:

I think it is so hypocritical to pretend to be concerned with the environment for the civilian population and not apply the same concerns to the military. Everyone is up in arms about the destruction of the Rain Forest in South America yet you allow an entire forest to be destroyed in South Mississippi along with a wildlife refuge for no good reason. How much of our children's future are you willing to give away?

1. What will the increase of fuel tank trucks to highways 49, bloody 98 and Janice Road. Since you are not building a pipeline how else will the fuel be brought in. These tanks only get one half mile to the gallon under normal movement, the amount they get during maneuvers will be greatly decreased. Have there been any studies to determine the amount of fuel we are talking about. I have seen two and three tanks moving at one time and the cloud of dust is horrible the exhaust is equally as bad. Has there been any studies to determine the effects of the dust and fuel on the environment. I have respiratory problems and this is a big concern to me. When 120 tanks go at one time the exhaust and dust will be unbelievable

2. The noise pollution will be unbearable with any increase in the helicopter flights over the area. The air to ground firing already is very bad. Will the fuel storage areas be in any danger during air to ground firing.

3. Before you allow the National Guard to occupy more land should you not find out what kind of tenants they have been with the land they have already be allowed to use. The impact area was closed by the EPA last fall why, because they were good tenants.

4. I have a well for my water will this be effected?

5. Poplar and Chaney Creeks cross my land, at times the water is so muddy from maneuvers without it having rained. How much worse will the streams be with battalion size maneuvers?

The run off will contain oil from the tank service areas and accidents. Will we be able to fish in Black Creek?

6. A large majority of the campers going to the refuge area have to pass my home to get there during hunting season as well as the campers during the summer months. Believe me the amount that I see will leave a large hole in the economy of the area, has there been any studies to determine the impact and how it will be replaced?

133:1

133:2

133:3

133:4

133:5

133:6

133:7

133:8

133:9

133:10

133:11

133:11 Comment noted. No significant hunting season effects are predicted. Some decrease in summer camping activity may result. This is discussed in section 3.5.10 of the Final EIS.

133:12 Commentor is correct. Beginning June 1993 the National Guard and Army Reserve will be converting to the new pay system (JSS-RC). Funds will be transferred directly to an individual's bank account for those enrolled in Sure-Pay, otherwise a check will be mailed to their home of record. Regardless of the timing of AT pay distribution, most individuals bring some funds with them to AT. Section 3.5.10 of the Final EIS addresses economic effects of all alternatives.

133:13 See response to comment 2:310.

133:14 The 155th Armor Brigade is not scheduled for future deactivation. This is evidenced by the fact that they are not on any force reduction plans, they are assigned a critical mission as a "Roundup" brigade of the 1st Cavalry Division, and has been equipped with the new M1A1 Main Battle Tank. Also see response to comment 2:6 and to misconception 9.

133:15 See response to comment 2:6.

7. There are times when the National Guard will not be paid until they return to their home towns. It is my understanding a computer system is being put in place now that would eliminate all payment of soldiers while at summer camp. Also they will be more time spent in camp in the future which will decrease almost all local spending by the military. Their spending will all be done at the PX not helping the local economy at all.

6. Has there been any thought given to using simulators for tank training that others branches of service now use. This would allow a much greater range of combat situations.

7. Does the 155th have enough future as a combat unit to warrant the destruction of an entire forest. Does the guard as a whole have enough future as combat soldier? The average age of 155th guard is high also. Also one third of the 155th were classified as non-deployable because they failed medical and dental screening. None of the problems identified in the GAO study were associated with lack of training space.

Betty Mason
Brooklyn, Ms. 39425

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Carolyn Masters

76 Shady Lane
Hattiesburg, MS 39402
February 7, 1992

Mr. Tom Craven
Mobile District, Corps of Engineers
CESAM-PD-EI
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Al 36628

Dear Mr. Craven:

As a resident of Hattiesburg since 1952, I am very much aware of the importance that Camp Shelby has played in the lives of people who have worked and trained at the facility. Often when speaking with people from other parts of the country, I find that they recognize Hattiesburg as the city close to Camp Shelby.

However, as the final EIS for the expansion of Camp Shelby begins, I do not believe that it has considered another very important aspect of Hattiesburg's fame, also spoken about by people who visit us. I am speaking of the undeveloped forests in the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area and other tracts in question which provide habitat for a generous population of song birds. Scientists such as Dr. Frank Moore at U.S.M., who was quoted recently in U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, point out that forests within 100 miles of the Gulf of Mexico are necessary for the survival of these birds.

Therefore, I request that the final EIS address the impact that the expansion will have on our fragile co-inhabitants of spaceship earth. It must show in specific numbers how the clearing and thinning of thousands of acres of land will affect the 71% of eastern North American birds which are declining. (Use data collected by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service as analyzed in the 1989 "Breeding Bird Survey") Also it must show the effect of noise pollution on the breeding habits of these birds, especially the endangered red-cockaded woodpecker. (One study, The Effects of Noise on the Nesting Behavior and Productivity of Eastern Wild Turkey, was done by Lynch/Speakein 1978.)

I firmly believe that the MS National Guard can find ways to use its established tank-maneuvering area at Camp Shelby more efficiently so as to continue training its members. It does not have to destroy the habitat of those creatures who cannot adapt to our ways and who depend upon us for their survival. We can have military preparedness and a beautiful and richly diverse environment.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Masters

(Mrs.) Carolyn Masters

134:1 Extensive additional coverage in Sections address the issues of biodiversity and forest fragmentation and the effects on non-game species, including songbirds. Please also see the comment and response to comment 6:1 and response to comments 2:132 and 2:371.

134:2 The Final EIS contains such an estimate. See the response to comment 14:16 and Section 3.3.2.4.1 of the Final EIS.

134:3 The section in the Draft EIS concerning the effects of noise on wildlife has been revised and expanded. This revised discussion has been moved to chapter 3, section 3.1.5.4 of the Final EIS.

134:4 Comment noted. Preparers rely on statements of specific concerns to assist in developing appropriate coverage in the Final EIS.

134:1

134:2

134:3

134:4

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
David Masters

135:1 See response to comment 62:1.

* Dec. 6, 1998

Dear Mr. Craven, (cc: RECIPIENT)

I would appreciate it if you would
delay the official start of ^{extend the} public comment
period for the Environmental Impact Statement
for use of the Desoto N.F. by Camp Shelby.
We have received our copies of the EIS/study but
this month, with Christmas activities, it is impractical
to prepare a response to the EIS. Thanks, David M.

135:1

BRYANT MATHER
136:1
136:2
136:3
136:4
136:5
136:6
136:7
136:8
136:9
136:10
136:11
136:12
136:13
136:14
136:15
136:16
136:17
136:18
136:19
136:20
136:21
136:22
136:23
136:24
136:25
136:26
136:27
136:28
136:29
136:30
136:31
136:32
136:33
136:34
136:35
136:36
136:37
136:38
136:39
136:40
136:41
136:42
136:43
136:44
136:45
136:46
136:47
136:48
136:49
136:50
136:51
136:52
136:53
136:54
136:55
136:56
136:57
136:58
136:59
136:60
136:61
136:62
136:63
136:64
136:65
136:66
136:67
136:68
136:69
136:70
136:71
136:72
136:73
136:74
136:75
136:76
136:77
136:78
136:79
136:80
136:81
136:82
136:83
136:84
136:85
136:86
136:87
136:88
136:89
136:90
136:91
136:92
136:93
136:94
136:95
136:96
136:97
136:98
136:99
136:100

Mobile District, CE
CESAM-PD-EI
Box 2288
Mobile AL 36628-0001

1 March 1992

Gentlemen

The inclosed came to me yesterday. It says the deadline is 1 March. I hope this meets it.

I am opposed to permitting tank training in the De Soto National Forest especially the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area. I doubt there is a need for more real estate to run tanks or flow is now already owned by the Army. Many bases are being closed, why should this one be enlarged at severe cost to the environment.

Please don't approve it. Please reconsider.

Sincerely

Bryant Mather

Encl

cc w/o Encl
col. Bet Denton

MS Sierra Club & Citizens Against the
Land Steal "Alert" to Friends of DeSoto
National Forest attached to this letter
not reproduced in this FEIS.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Bryant Mather

136:1 Comment noted. See response to comment 62:1 and general misconception statements 5, 8, 12, and 19.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Wayne McCardle

Wayne R. McCardle
232 Pearces Road
Hattiesburg, Ms. 39401
24 February 1992

Mobile District,
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
CESAN-PD-EI
ATTN: Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001

TO ALL INTERESTED PARTIES:

Camp Shelby and the Desoto National Forest has sustained my family since conception of both; and the land long before. I have studied the Shelby EIS—citizens', environmental and governmental groups' knowledge and comments.

The simple truths ring clear:
Military doctrines, weaponry, and training requirements change rapidly.
Nature is constant if protected from dramatic human changes which cause long-term effects.

The main desires:
Military stated need for Shelby tank maneuver expansion.
The citizens stated hope to keep the relatively unspoiled and unpopulated Perry County's Leaf River Wildlife Management Area's forests, streams, wildlife, and beauty as is.

All of the Shelby EIS Alternatives have limitations.
Alternative Three B seems the more "even deal". With only 2,330 acres or eleven percent less net usable acreage than the Corps of Engineer's recommended and preferred Alternative One, Plan Three B would meet the main expressed desires of the Citizens and the Military. So my first reason for this opinion is one of fairness.

Also Public Safety would be increased by consolidation of explosive shells, tracked armored units, dud areas, traffic maneuvers, lasers, forest fires, surface and subsurface contamination, live firing ground and aerial, dust, etc. into a finite boundary. Plan 3-B would consolidate all of the various Restricted Areas.

Economically it would provide for less long-term loss of productive public land incomes verses expenditures dependant on Congressional approval.

Socially it would provide for a greater "spiritual well being" of the local citizenry whom have sacrificed in the past and will continue to do so for the good of our country.

Thank you for this opportunity to express my opinions. I have been blessed to have seen this democratic process take place.

Wayne R. McCardle
Wayne R. McCardle

137:1 Comment noted. Please also see general misconception statement 7.

137:2 Comment noted. No proposed alternative would allow firing of live ammunition in any place other than near the present impact area. See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:81 and misconceptions 12, 13, and 19.

137:3 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:5.

137:4 Comment noted.

137:1

137:2

137:3

137:4

February 23, 1992

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mrs. Pat McDaniel

138:1 Comment noted. Please also see general misconception statements 5, 12, 17, 22, and 23.

138:2 Comment noted. Data collected to date on Army installations indicate that some wildlife species do thrive in disturbed habitats while others do not. See section 3.3.2.4.1 of the Final EIS.

138:3 Comment noted.

Mr. Thomas M. Craven
Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

This letter is to ask you please do not allow the military to take over any more of our DeSoto National Forest.

138:1

Wild Life habitats are shrinking at best, and to say that some of the area will accommodate both tanks and wildlife is a myth.

138:2

Please help us preserve this area for our children's heritage.

138:3

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Pat McDaniel

(Mrs.) Pat McDaniel

2308 Middlecoff Drive
Gulfport, MS 39507

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Ms. Sandra McDaniel

Mrs. Max H. McDaniel
1455 Rebel Drive
Jackson, Mississippi 39211

February 19, 1992

Dear Mr. Craven,

I would like to express my total opposition to expanded tank training in the St. Louis National Forest.

My reasons include those from the environmental impact statement; - loss of timber revenues from massive clear-cutting; - damage to fragile ecosystems which involve protected animals and plants; - noise pollution which has not been adequately studied; - loss of forestry and forest-related jobs; - diminished quality of life, especially for people who live near the proposed tank training; - no established mission or need; - The recent reduction in the military and halted production on the M-1 tanks; - loss of recreational facilities to visitors from across the country.

Please do whatever you can to see that this proposed expansion of tank training does not take place.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Sandra McDaniel,
Attorney at Law

139:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:2.
139:2 See response to comment 21:3.
139:3 See response to comment 21:4.
139:4 See response to comment 21:5.
139:5 See response to comment 21:6.
139:6 See response to comment 2:6.
139:7 See response to comment 21:7.
139:8 See response to comment 21:8.

139:1

139:2

139:3

139:4

139:5

139:6

139:7

139:8

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Randolf McDannald

140:1 Comment noted. No land acquisition is involved, nor are any of the lands potentially affected a wilderness. See general misconception statements 5, 10, 12, 13, 15, and 23.

140:2 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 2:6 and general misconception statements 7 and 8.

Mobile District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers CISM-PD_EI

Attn: Thomas M. Craven

P.O. Box 2288

Mobile, AL 36628-0001

To whom it may concern:

I am writing this letter to express my concern about the National Guard's efforts to acquire land in Desoto National Forest, specifically the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area. The Army Core of Engineer's Environmental Impact Statement poses a direct threat to the environmental well being of the state. The E.I.S. proposes to clear cut 21,217 acres of unspoiled wilderness. In this era of declining global tensions, and National Guard budget cuts, it seems only reasonable to oppose the National Guard's preferred plan of Alternative One, in favor of the compromise Alternative Three B. As a life long Mississippi resident and a veteran of the U.S. Army, I feel that it is in Mississippi's best interest to preserve the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area.

Sincerely,

B. Randolph McDannald

140:1

140:2

140:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Ms. Helen McGinnis

Helen McGinnis
Rt. 2, Box 530
Edwards, MS 39066

February 29, 1992

Mobile District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
C-33N-PD-RI, Attn: Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-001

Dear Mr. Craven:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on Military Training Use of National Forest Lands, Camp Shelby, Mississippi issued in November, 1991.

The document does not adequately demonstrate a need for the proposed expansion of maneuver areas (proposed training areas or PTAs). The possibility that Mississippi National Guard units could travel to other sites in the Southeast or elsewhere in the country is dismissed in a single paragraph (1-35). These options should be discussed in detail with facts and figures to support the conclusion.

It appears that overlap between the tank gunnery safety fan and possible PTAs north of FS route 303 is the main reason that Alternatives 3A and 3B are rejected. The possibility of scheduling training activities so both tank gunnery and battalion-level activities could occur should be presented in more detail.

A 1991 General Accounting Office report concludes that soldiers in the MS National Guard 155th armored brigade were not ready for combat in the Persian Gulf for reasons that had nothing to do with lack of space for maneuvers. Would the 155th have been ready if the expanded maneuver areas were available?

The document includes several biological misconceptions with regard to the proposed clearing and thinning of the PTAs. As used by biologists, "biodiversity" refers to the entire complement of native plants and animal in a broad geographic region. The DEIS states that leaving clumps of trees and increasing forest edge will increase biodiversity. To the contrary. Species adapted to cleared lands and forest edges are those that can co-exist and even thrive in proximity to man. Species needing large blocks of uncleared land--much more than 40 or 50 acres--are declining worldwide and will suffer on the Special Use permit land. Regional biological diversity (biodiversity) will be reduced.

Site Fidelity. Some species are bound to a certain location and will stay there despite habitat alterations. For a generalist species there may be few problems. Species with narrow habitat requirements may not do well. Individuals may either die, or fail to reproduce, and the species will eventually disappear from the site.

141:1 Comment noted. See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31.

141:2 Comment noted. Commenter's reasoning is on target, however several other training factors must be addressed in order that your question can be clarified. The number one factor is that Camp Shelby does not have a battalion task force training area now. In the past the National Guard and the USFS have tried several different procedures to accomplish both maneuver and tank gunnery, they are:
(1) schedule tank gunnery only during AT; (2) schedule tank gunnery during AT and also allow firing on weekends during March, April, and September; (3) allow firing during AT and on selected weekends throughout the year. (This was done during M60A3 firing). Because of environmental constraints which leave insufficient area north of FS 303, Alternatives 3A and 3B are not the best choices for military training as evaluated by the EIS. Each of these options was affected by the fact that reserve (NG) units can train only 39 days a year, including home station training requirements. Armor units must qualify their armored vehicle crews by firing various tank gunnery tables and must also train in maneuver to accomplish full readiness requirements. Brigade commanders must plan to accomplish these activities. To assist these commanders, the Training Site needs to have the maneuver area totally removed from the firing fans to increase scheduling opportunities. If both events can occur simultaneously, especially during AT, then the number of weekends utilized would be decreased.

Alternative 3B also has severe environmental restrictions due to the presence of the threatened gopher tortoise. The US Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion (Appendix L) states that selection of Alternative 3B would be considered a violation of the Endangered Species Act. Please also see misconception 7.

141:3 See responses to comments 16:7 and 2:6.

141:4 See response to comments 1:9, 1:11, 2:132, and 2:371.

Comments 141:5 and 141:6 are found on the following page

141:5 Comment noted. The use of forested islands was considered as superior only to the severe thinning originally suggested. See response to comments 1:9, 1:11, and 3:19.

141:6 Comment noted. The commentator is assuming that every adjacent habitat is at carrying capacity for every species. This theory frequently is not substantiated in practice. "Wildlife" includes hundreds (thousands, depending on individual interpretation) of species. Each species, or similar groups of species, may respond differently to habitat alteration. There is no simple yes or no answer to the question if displaced individuals will survive. Examples of factors to consider include, but are not limited to these brief examples.

"Fragmentation" is also misused. The proposal to leave 40-50-acre clumps of trees on the PTAs, connected by corridors when possible, is fragmentation of a contiguous forested habitat. It is comparable to the fragmentation that occurs when forests are reduced to isolated woodlots in agricultural areas or in suburbs. The alternative of thinning trees to six per acre is forest destruction.

The document further states that forest species inhabiting the areas to be thinned or cleared will move into the remaining areas of forest habitat (3-80). In fact, the remaining habitat is already occupied by other individuals of the affected species. Most of the displaced animals will die, and the populations will decline.

Some of the clumps of trees that are left on the PTAs would be used for "tactical concealment." (3-81). Will the trees, understory and soils in the clumps that are used in this way be damaged? According to page 3-87, hardwoods remaining in thinned or cleared areas will produce mast for wildlife. They won't produce unless they are permitted to grow to sufficient size. Slash (tree tops etc.) left after thinning and clearing will be of use to wildlife for a year or two at most--hardly worth mentioning as a wildlife benefit.

Nothing is said about the impacts of clearing, thinning, and tracked vehicle maneuvering on the threatened gopher tortoise. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's biological opinion in Appendix L addresses current military use of the area. Will the tortoises be relocated? If so, you must know that tortoise relocation is still experimental. It is yet to be demonstrated that relocated tortoises survive. I count 75 burrows in proposed clearings on PTA 6 (pages 3-51 and 3-52). The concentration of tortoises on PTA 6 may make Alternative 3B unfeasible.

Soil and vegetation conditions on the proposed 10,909 acres of "turn-back" area need to be described in detail, especially the species composition, ages, and condition of the trees.

Possible impacts on recreation should be studied further. The DEIS states that hunters should benefit from increased open areas and road access. However, deer may then be more vulnerable to hunters. If so, the deer population may decline unless the length of the deer season is reduced. A reduced season and other possible restriction would not benefit deer hunters.

Helicopter use from the proposed PTAs near Black Creek, the Black Creek Wilderness, and the Leaf River Wilderness could be especially disturbing to recreationists. The possibility should be studied.

The survey of recreation use on the Special Use permit lands does not consider the fact that the ultimate negative impact on recreation

Mobility. Species that fly will have no trouble leaving the area. Other species may have a more difficult time. Some salamander species are not too mobile, may encounter habitat barriers, and also expose themselves to excessive predation hazards. A bird can fly a mile or two in just a few minutes, a 3 inch long red backed salamander may not have a good chance of travelling that distance in a hostile environment.

Dispersal success/social structure. Once a species has reached new territory several factors such as social structure, if there is any, may affect the survival of an individual. Are the available niches occupied? Is there going to be territorial disputes? Will the individual have to keep searching for an unoccupied territory- thus increasing life threatening risks, or having to occupy marginal habitat. Also, for a short lived species the failure to breed/ reproduce may be important.

Some species need a nucleus population, and if there is insufficient population in the unaltered habitat, escaping individuals may not form the bonds needed to perpetuate themselves, and the individuals are subjected to greater individual risks (prairie chickens are a classic example--when introducing them into unoccupied habitat you need a core group of at least 20 -the more the better to release together). Weather, stress, and the time of year of displacement are some additional factors affecting the survival of individual animals.

There is no clear cut, simple answer. Some individuals make it, some don't. There are a lot of variables. Many biologists think that the majority of vertebrates make it.

Any vegetation management activity will alter habitat. They usually favor some species and are detrimental to others. For example, quail management will be detrimental to the ovenbird. A management decision may be made to favor quail by improving quail habitat. This will not affect the ovenbird as a species but might affect individuals. An important exception are the sensitive, threatened, and endangered species where the survival of individuals is considered paramount to the survival of the species.

141:7 This "concealment island" concept expressed in the Draft EIS has been superseded by the "habitat corridor" approach. Please see response to comments 1:9 and 1:11.

141:8 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 3:20.

141:9 Comment noted. Commentor's conclusions parallel those of the National Guard and the USFWS, and are reflected in the 1992 and 1993 Biological Opinions on the gopher tortoise, where it is concluded that Alternative 3B is untenable. See also response to comments 1:4 and 1:33.

141:10 Comment noted. Section 3.3.2.6 of the Final EIS displays the present vegetation associated with each alternative, and the number of acres to be cleared or thinned or upon which no action is proposed by vegetation type.

141:11 Comment noted. The whitetailed deer is considered favored by increased edge habitat and openings to a degree that increased hunter success seems unlikely to affect its proliferation.

(Responses to Comments 141:12 and 141:13 on Following Page)

tion use is non-use, which may be voluntary or involuntary. The number of recreation days currently lost, especially on weekends, should be estimated. The ultimate voluntary reaction to extreme disturbance is avoidance. How many days of recreation use are lost because people find present military use excessively disturbing? How many more would avoid the area if the preferred alternative was implemented? Comparisons with nearby national forest areas and state wildlife management areas not utilized by the military would be helpful.

All predictions of beneficial, neutral and negative effects of implementation of the six alternatives plus mitigation are meaningful because none of the ITAM procedures have been formulated for the specific proposal. At most the techniques are in the beginning stages of implementation.

Many people are concerned about possible siltation of Black Creek through erosion of maneuver areas. Could estimates be provided?

Purchase of additional national forest lands to compensate for lost timber productivity on the PTAs or more intense management of other national forest lands for timber are mentioned in passing. The former might be acceptable but is probably not feasible. The second alternative is not environmentally acceptable. Timber production is already overemphasized on the Mississippi national forests at the expense of other mandated uses such as watershed protection, water, wildlife, and recreation.

More information on soil compaction and the number of times that heavy tracked vehicles would be passing over cleared areas should be provided. If a tracked vehicle passes over a given piece of ground only twice in a year, how long will the compaction last?

How long will the PTAs be needed? Any projections about forest management over a period of 40 to 100 years are probably meaningless. I would guess that tracked vehicles now in use will be obsolete long before that time. Tracked vehicles may not even be used 40 years from now.

To conclude, the DEIS does not justify the need for Alternatives 1 or 2 when we consider that facts that global Communism is no longer a threat, that we have a massive federal debt, and that cutbacks of 30% are anticipated in overall military expenditures. These alternatives would cause massive disruption of a significant portion of the Black Creek Ranger District. Alternative 3B is not acceptable either without reasonable assurance that the resident soldier torpedoes would be unharmed. The only feasible alternatives remaining are 3A, 4, 5, or 6.

Thanks again for the DEIS.

Sincerely,

Walter Williams

141:12 The locations of the proposed aviation use areas are not in any proximity to the wilderness areas mentioned. See Sections 3.2.4 and 3.3.5.2 of the Final EIS.

141:13 Comment noted. There is little or no midsummer use of the upland areas other than developed recreation facilities in any District on the De Soto National Forest. This is the season of heavy military use, and the time separation assists in minimizing potential for conflict. Please also see response to comments 21:8 and 102:5.

141:14 Comment noted. The mitigation procedures described throughout this EIS are expected to become the basis of ITAM implementation plans. Preparers have presented a proposed program capable of addressing both general and specific effects, as they become known. The National Guard has committed personnel and funds to implement ITAM.

141:15 Comment Noted. See response to comments 10:5, 27:3 and 14:46 and misconception 15.

141:16 Your comment is noted. The mitigation measures are mentioned as possibilities for consideration by the decision maker, who will then decide on implementation or if additional study is needed to determine feasibility.

All resources on the National Forests in Mississippi are managed under the management guidelines and direction furnished by the Land and Resource Management Plan for the National Forests in Mississippi. This plan attempted to balance the production of all resource outputs to obtain the most beneficial mix or net public benefit. This plan was the result of public input over a three year period and was available for public comment following completion. It was completed in 1985 and is scheduled for significant revision within the next two years. Your concern with the emphasis on timber management should be expressed to the Forest Service when public scoping for issues takes place during the revision process.

141:17 As discussed in Section 3.1.1.3.2 of the Final EIS, the effects of even relatively heavy use are clearly diminished in ten years of rest. See also the response to comment 2:151.

141:18 Comment noted. It seems likely that tracked vehicles will be in use for at least several decades. The PTA's will be needed until decisions are made at a national level which changes the role/training needs of the National Guard. We agree that forest management projections beyond forty years are probably meaningless. The areas impacted by tank maneuvering may be returned to timber production when no longer needed. A stand of trees may be established and a thinning harvest of pulpwood obtained within 15-20 years. See also the response to comments 3:12 and 17:5.

141:19 See response to comments 2:6 and 21:7, and misconception 8.

141:20 Comment noted.

December 12, 1991

The Honorable Trent Lott
The Senate of Mississippi
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

RE: DeSoto National Forest "Land Swap"

Dear Senator Lott:

It is not often that I find myself agreeing with The Clarion Ledger on an issue, but I wholeheartedly endorse the enclosed editorial regarding this impending transfer of Mississippi land. I am not a wild-eyed environmentalist, but rather a conservative corporate type. This proposal has been rammed through in such a heavy-handed way that I feel compelled to speak up.


The area in question is one of the few truly unspoiled areas remaining in this State. It is inhabited by several endangered species. When the deer and turkey populations were decimated early in this century, it was this forest from which the stocks were taken to regenerate those populations around Mississippi. Why give this resource over to slow destruction when other, far less sensitive, options are available?

Troops and equipment from all over America already come to Camp Shelby and other military facilities in Mississippi. We are doing our part for national defense. Given the reduced need for military services and training in the face of the massive changes in Europe and Asia, I just cannot see any need for this massive seizure of additional public lands in Mississippi.

A knee-jerk decision should not be made that this transfer should happen, simply because the military wants it to happen. Our military leaders do make mistakes, and this is one of them. I solicit your opposition to this unwarranted and unnecessary boondoggle. The DeSoto National Forest should remain undisturbed. I do not want to have to explain to my grandchildren why their government caused such unnecessary destruction.

Thank you for considering my views.

Sincerely,


Mark F. McIntosh

Mark F. McIntosh, Esq.
910 Fairview Street
Jackson, Mississippi 39202

Enclosure

142:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 2:6 and 10:1. See general misconception statements 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.

142:2 See response to comment 2:6 and misconception 8.

142:1

142:2

142:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
William McKeil

Telephone 601-769-4317

William M. McKeil, Jr., M.D., F.A.C.P., F.A.C.G.
Internal Medicine & Gastroenterology

5702 Jefferson Street
Pascagoula, Mississippi 39367

February 17, 1992

Mr. Thomas M. Craven
USA Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven,

I would like to express my opposition to the expansion of tank training at the Desoto National Forest. This land, the forest, the wildlife - these irreplaceable items belong to the American people, not to the National Guard. The present world situation does not demand irresponsible actions such as this. Ecology and forestry (not to mention forestry-related and game management - related jobs) should not suffer because of tunnel-visioned military brass and "I'll scratch your back if you'll scratch mine" politicians!

Thank you for your consideration,

William M. McKeil, Jr., M.D.

WMM/mjg

- 143:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 9 and 23.
143:2 See response to comment 2:6 and misconception 8.
143:3 Comment noted. See also response to comments 21:3 and 21:5.

144:1 See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31 and misconception 8.

62 / Eng. G. Can.
Jas. W. H. H. H.
24211
Oct. 20, 1973

Thomas H. Lincoln
H. O. Henry (Carpenter) Engineering
Mobile, Alabama

Dear Mr. Lincoln,
I enclosed my pretense with three
published ones! for many reasons!
At a time when the government
and State, are frankly easily
taking into and cutting of frankly.

144:1

And, somewhere, there is a
frankly separate and already in
me for the entirely out of the
frankly! Thank you for your time
and attention, Sara P. McLeod

Letters to the Editor (Clarion-Ledger,
2/19/92) attached to this letter not
reproduced in this FEIS.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Randall McPherson

Rt. 2 Box 1266
Starkville, MS 39759
February 19, 1992

Thomas M. Craven
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2286
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

The purpose of this letter is to voice my opposition to the expansion of Camp Shelby into the Desoto National Forest. One should pay particular attention to the long term cost/benefit ratio of such a proposal.

What is the cost to the people of Mississippi? I think that the biggest cost is the destruction of one of the most beautiful places in the state of Mississippi. In August 1989 my wife and I went backpacking in the wilderness area of Desoto National Forest and this was one of the most enjoyable wilderness experiences that I have ever had. This is the only place that I know of in Mississippi where a person can backpack and camp outside of a campground. There are too few places like Desoto National Forest for people to enjoy.

What is the benefit to the people of Mississippi? The main benefit that I see is to a few businessmen in the Hattiesburg area. Sure there is an economic benefit to the few, but what of the aesthetic cost to the many?

Perhaps the strongest argument against the use of National Forest land for tank maneuvers is from a practical point of view. Why at the end of the Cold War, does the National Guard need land for tank maneuvers. Cannot the regular Army better take care of small-fry like Iraq and Panama? The recent Gulf War demonstrated that National Guard units were not war-ready and, in fact, I would not expect them to be since they only meet one weekend a month for limited training. I question the merit of sacrificing a valuable resource for something that has not been demonstrated to have equal or greater value.

Consider whether or not the mission of the National Guard will be changed in the near future in light of recent world developments. There should be a definite long term requirement of the Guard for extensive tank maneuvers before they are allowed to severely damage this valuable resource.

Sincerely,

Randall McPherson
Randall McPherson

145:1

145:2

145:3

145:4

145:5

145:1 Comment noted. The benefits of national defense are virtually impossible to quantify, and cannot be compared to costs except in comparison to other options. As noted in Section 1.1.2.3, the costs of conducting this training elsewhere are much greater. See general misconception statement 5.

145:2 Your comment is noted and we're glad you enjoyed your backpacking experience. All National Forest land in Mississippi is available for hiking and camping unless closed for safety or resource protection reasons. Information on other trails within the National Forests in Mississippi may be obtained from a local Forest Service office or from the Supervisor's Office, 100 W. Capitol St., Suite 1141, Jackson, MS 39269.

There are two designated wilderness areas in Mississippi, both on the Black Creek Ranger District. The Leaf Wilderness is 3 miles east of the Camp Shelby Special Use permit area and the Black Creek Wilderness is from 2 to 5 miles south of the permit area. The impact on these areas from military training will not increase from any of the proposed action alternatives. See also response to comment 21:8.

145:3 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 3:12 and 17:5 and misconceptions 10 and 25.

145:4 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 2:6 and 2:31 and misconception 8.

145:5 Comment noted. The mission of the National Guard has recently been clarified, and it calls for increased, not decreased, training of mechanized units. Please also see response to comments 2:6, 3:12 and 17:5.

146:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 5, 7, and 11.

Dear Mr. Craven
In reference to the proposed
expansion of tank & truck
vehicle maneuvers area in
the Desoto National Forest.
I support alternative "3 B" and
I oppose alternative "1".
Sincerely
David Miller

146:1

February 26, 1992:

To whom it may concern:

I understand that the Mississippi National Guard is still considering expansion into the DeSoto National Forest. In my opinion, this would be a tremendous step backwards for Mississippi, the nation, and the world.

The argument that pro-expanders use is that without the additional land, 800 jobs would be lost. This seems a little hard to believe considering the number of people from National Guard units around Hattiesburg during the summer. But let's say that hypothetically the jobs would be lost. Do you think that in today's world, where people are trying to preserve the environment, 800 jobs really justify destroying 39,772 acres of forest land? I don't think so.

It's time to wake up and realize that the trees are our answer to saving the environment. Trees absorb carbon dioxide. This cleans the air and prevents the effects of global warming. Trees are also our producers of oxygen. If the above two arguments aren't convincing enough just ask the squirrels and birds who live in those trees. Where do you think they'll go? Do you think that we as humans have the right to destroy the homes for animals?

I understand that organizations such as the Sierra Club are trying to negotiate and allow some expansion (alternative 3B?). I am asking that the whole idea be totally forgotten. Let's show the world that we care in Mississippi. This would be a great way for Mississippi to set an example to other states that are also faced with the issue of destroying environment to save jobs. There are other answers, I know it. It just takes a little bit of creativity in the leadership. I have thought of a couple of solutions. For example, why not continue training at a company level? I can't understand why you have to train at a battalion size. I am personally aware of other training sites such as Ft. Irwin where battalion level training is more than accommodated. Also, why not change the training to something that does not require as much space? Why not train medic units, or light infantry?

Please, before you make your decision, consider life in Mississippi with the forest preserved, and with it destroyed. With it preserved, things would be business as usual for the animals (and tourists). The forest, which took hundreds of thousands of years to develop, would still stand tall giving the area a rich wilderness feel. Mississippi would be a step ahead in the movement to preserve the environment. With it destroyed, all that is left is a wasteland. The animals have all died from losing their homes. The air around Hattiesburg suddenly seems less fresh. The 800 jobs that were promised to be kept are suddenly lost due to a decreasing defense budget. A national treasure is lost forever.

Concerned Citizen

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

T. Miller

147:1 Comment noted. Economic benefit has never been used by the proponent as a justification for the preferred alternative. See general misconception statement 25. The acreage figure quoted represents the study area, not the area actually proposed to be cleared or thinned.

147:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 14:47 and 35:27.

147:3 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 21:3 and 141:6.

147:4 See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31.

147:5 Comment noted. This option is discussed briefly in Section 1.2.9 of the Final EIS, where use of only classroom training is examined. The problem is that there is no mission in the FORSCOM structure for such a facility, and there is a large, unmet demand for tracked vehicle maneuver capability. See response to comment 147:4.

147:6 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 3:12 and 14:46 and general misconception statements 9, 10 and 11.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Claire Morrison

Feb. 24, 1992
#4 Boggsdale
Long Beach, Ms.
39560

Thomas M. Craven
Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, Ala. 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

please save our De Soto National Forest, it
belongs to me, my children, grandchildren, and
all generations to come.

My family has paid taxes in Mississippi for
over 125 years. We love Miss, and want to preserve
this beautiful park.

We have nothing to gain by letting tanks and the
military take any part of it. We will lose the
revenue from the timber, we will damage the
ecosystems which protects the animals and plants.

Sincerely,

Claire Boggs Morrison

Claire Boggs Morrison
#4 Boggsdale
Long Beach, Ms. 39560

- 148:1 Comment noted. Please see general misconception statements 9 and 22.
148:2 Comment noted. Please see general misconception statement 12.
148:3 Please see response to comments 21:2 and 21:3.

148:1

148:2

148:3

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Corley Morse

CSTS-DPTM

11 February 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR Department of the Army, Mobile District, Corps of
Engineers, P.O. Box 2288, Attn: Tom Craven, Mobile,
AL 36628-0001

SUBJECT: Authorized Tank Maneuver Weekends in Draft EIS for Camp Shelby

1. Reference Draft EIS page 3-26, line 18.
2. The referenced sentence indicates only twelve (12) weekends can be utilized for battalion task force maneuver outside Annual Training. In the Maneuver Use Plan, the actual number of weekends varies from 13 (TY 93) to 14 weekends during the periods outside of Annual Training.
3. Although the National Guard will probably never utilize any more than the referenced 12 weekends for battalion size maneuver training, recommend changing the EIS so that all 14 available weekends are evaluated for battalion size maneuver.
4. We also need to ensure that T-43 and TA-35 are evaluated for track maneuver (see Appendix K, page K-10, para 503, of Draft EIS). The only area of evaluation for this concept that the undersigned can find in the DEIS is on page 3-68 as a part of the CALFEX assembly areas and this only includes parts of TA-35. This proposal needs to be evaluated to include concurrent usage for all 28 weekends proposed for tank firing in both TA-35 and T-43. I remember Dr. Balbach having this covered in a previous edition (draft) but cannot find in the current DEIS.

5. Point of contact is the undersigned at DSN 921-2476.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

Corley W. Morse
CORLEY W. MORSE, JR
LTC, US, MSARNG
DPTM

CF:
CSTS-CDR
CSTS-DFE
CSTS-DPTM-RC
MS-FMD (Bob Lee)

149:1 Comment noted. Preparers note that one concern with proposing more periods that at present will result in the impacts being proportionally increased, even if they may not be utilized.

149:2 The US Forest Service, in their comments on the Draft EIS, requested removal of even that mention (p 3-68 in Draft EIS) of the use of TA 35 from the proposal. Please see comment 2:40. It is not a part of the current proposed action.

149:1

149:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Michael Murdock

150:1 Comment noted. If a permit is issued for tank maneuvering, it will be for a ten year period at which time the need will be re-evaluated. A special use permit for military use of National Forest lands may only be issued when the need is established under the Master Agreement between the Secretaries of Agriculture and Defense. Thus when the need no longer exists, the permitted land will return to normal National Forest management. See additional coverage in Section 1.1.1 of the Final EIS. See response to comments 2:6 and 2:31 and general misconception statement 9.

150:2 Comment noted. See response to comment 21:7.

2-18-91

Thomas M. Cramer

150:1
If tank training is expanded
in the Desoto National Forest
the people will not run get
it back, reduction in the mili-
tary halted production in M-1
tanks this is no need.
150:2

Michael Murdock

Thank you

MICHAEL MURDOCK
RT 2 BOX 249 MOSELEY MS
39459

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Anna Musgrave

- 151:1 Comment noted. Please also see misconceptions 5 and 9.
151:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6.

151:1

151:2

Mar. Feb 3, 1992
I am concerned about the extreme
woodland destruction being
contemplated at Camp Shelby for
a training area for tanks.
We don't need tanks today. Please
do all that you can to stop this
plan.

Sincerely,
Anna Musgrave
P.O. Box 824, Hattiesburg

4 FEB REC'D

2-19-92

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am writing this letter to voice my opposition to the expansion of tank training facilities at Camp Shelby and the inevitable destruction of the DeSoto National Forest.

The most recent Environmental Impact Study listed several of the following:

1. Loss of timber revenue by massive clear-cutting.
2. Damage to animal and plant ecosystems.
3. Noise pollution
4. Loss of forestry related jobs.
5. Diminished quality of life
6. Reduction in military spending especially M-1 Tank
7. Loss of recreational facilities.

There is no established mission or need for this expansion at the above costs. PLEASE STOP THIS EXPANSION NOW!!!!!!

Sincerely,

J.E. & Reba Napier
P.O. Box 135
Rt. 1, MS-39465

- 152:1 Comment noted.
- 152:2 See response to comment 21:2.
- 152:3 See response to comment 21:3.
- 152:4 See response to comment 21:4.
- 152:5 See response to comment 21:5.
- 152:6 See response to comment 21:6.
- 152:7 See response to comment 21:7.
- 152:8 See response to comment 21:8.
- 152:9 See response to comment 2:6.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
R.M. Napier

2-19-92

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am writing this letter to voice my opposition to the expansion of tank training facilities at Camp Shelby and the inevitable destruction of the DeSoto National Forest.

The most recent Environmental Impact Study listed several of the following:

1. Loss of timber revenue by massive clear-cutting.
2. Damage to animal and plant ecosystems.
3. Noise pollution
4. Loss of forestry related jobs.
5. Diminished quality of life
6. Reduction in military spending especially M-1 Tank
7. Loss of recreational facilities.

There is no established mission or need for this

expansion at the above costs. PLEASE STOP THIS EXPANSION NOW!!!!!!

Sincerely,

R.M. Napier
Rt. 2 Box 50
Seminary, MS 39270

153:1 Comment noted.

153:2 See response to comment 21:2.

153:3 See response to comment 21:3.

153:4 See response to comment 21:4.

153:5 See response to comment 21:5.

153:6 See response to comment 21:6.

153:7 See response to comment 21:7.

153:8 See response to comment 21:8.

153:9 See response to comment 2:6.

153:1

153:2

153:3

153:4

153:5

153:6

153:7

153:8

153:9

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am writing this letter to voice my opposition to the expansion of tank training facilities at Camp Shelby and the inevitable destruction of the Desoto National Forest.

The most recent Environmental Impact Study listed several of the following:

1. Loss of timber revenue by massive clear-cutting.
2. Damage to animal and plant ecosystems.
3. Noise pollution
4. Loss of forestry related jobs.
5. Diminished quality of life
6. Reduction in military spending especially M-1 Tank
7. Loss of recreational facilities.

There is no established mission or need for this

expansion at the above costs. PLEASE STOP THIS EXPANSION NOW!!!!!!

Sincerely,

Wenda H. Napier
404 South Main St.
Petal, MS 39465

154:1 Comment noted.

154:2 See response to comment 21:2.

154:3 See response to comment 21:3.

154:4 See response to comment 21:4.

154:5 See response to comment 21:5.

154:6 See response to comment 21:6.

154:7 See response to comment 21:7.

154:8 See response to comment 21:8.

154:9 See response to comment 2:6.

154:1

154:2

154:3

154:4

154:5

154:6

154:7

154:8

154:9

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mrs. Doug Odom

156:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:2 and misconception 22.

156:2 See response to comment 21:7.

156:3 See response to comment 2:31. See general misconception statement 16.

156:1

156:2

156:3

Dear Mr. Craven,
February 22, 1992
I really find it incredible that I feel compelled to write to you to point out what is so painfully obvious to anyone who has observed the controversy over Camp Shelby expanding into the De Soto National Forest. It isn't getting into the economic or the negative effects such expansion would have on the timber industry, the environmental and political considerations are enough to put a damper to this destructive proposal.
Very simply, the De Soto National Forest belongs to the people and here is precious little of it left in the country today. Tank farms, burned timber, irreparably damaged the trees and the land, and you want? The cold war is over, and the M1 tanks are no longer being produced. Any training with empty tanks would be done on the plains of west Texas with little or no environmental impact.

156:4

He, the public, know all of this. You, the Army Corps of Engineers, refuse to acknowledge and get it. And you wonder why the Corps is mistrusted and often despised by the general public.

Again, it's incredible that a letter-writing campaign is even necessary. The fact literally screams for the defeat of the proposed steal of national forest lands. Only a few politicians seem to think otherwise, and they will definitely lean just how strongly we citizens feel about this issue during the next election.

Sincerely,
Doraine P. Odum
Jackson, MS

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Michele and Terry Odom

157:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:8. See general misconception statements 6, 9, 10, and 11.

2-27-92

Cops of Engineers
To whom it May Concern

We are writing this letter in protest of the tank training in the DeBolt Hill Forest. - We feel it should remain as it is today a great natural area for our state & visitors.

Please do not destroy one of these trees & plants, home for animals, game preserve, recreational facilities & the simple but very important beauty of this area.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Michele & Terry Odom
Dixie Community
129 Fillingame Road
Hothouse, MD. 39481

157:1

Mr. Thomas M. Craven,

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Debra Oglesbee

2-27-92

My name is Debra Oglesbee. I'm a Mother, of a 5 year old and an 2 year old. We live right beside, were they want, to put the tank trailers.

I have lived, in Terry County, just about, all my life. Where they are wanting, to cut the trees, and tear up the land, for the tanks.

They will be, so close, we will be able, to see them, from our house. And hear them as though there on our front porch, shooting.

We decided, to rise, our family in the County, for many reasons. One reason, was, for ~~Peace~~ Quiet. If the tank trailers go through there will be no peace. It will be like W.W.3. And as far as quiet, it would sound as if, tanks were shooting out of our front yard!

As far, as the National Guard goes, the ones who will

158:1 Comment noted. See response to comment 21:4 and 21:6. See general misconception statement 13.

158:2 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 13.

158:3 Comment noted. There is no live fire of weapons except into the designated impact area, and no proposal would change this. The provisions for safety of the general public are presented in Section 3.5.8.1 and the safety regulations are reproduced in Appendix C, Part 11, of the Final EIS. Please also see the response to comments 2:339 and 32:2.

158:1

158:2

158:3

be training down here. I really
fear for my family and friends,
Safely. Like, I said before. I
have lived here, almost my
whole life. And have seen, National
Awards, with beer in one hand, and a
gun, in the other. Whats going to
happen, when they miss their target,
because they had a little to much,
to drink. We will probably not,
be along, to talk about it.

So please helpers, keep
the tanks out. If not, for the
many trees, that are going to be
cut down. Then, how about, for
the lives of Human Beings, that
live down here, that could be
lost by one little Mishap.

Thank you,
Debra Oglesbee

Debra Oglesbee
180 John Bond Rd.
Wiggins Ms. 39577

159:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6 and general
misconception statements 5, 12, and 25.

Feb. 24, 92

Dear Senator Lott,

I'm writing to you in regards to
the expansion for tank training at
Camp Shelby Mississippi. I am very
much in favor of this land swap.
The troops need to be ready for any
mission that may occur. They
need space to train for these
missions. Without this expansion
Camp Shelby could lose over 100,000
troops that train here annually.
This could cause many people to
lose their jobs, that work full
and part-time at Camp Shelby. The
guard and reserve need your
support. Thanks

Sincerely,
Shirley Pace
116 Korman Ave.
H'burg. MS 39402

159:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mary Page

133 Caribbean Cove
Clinton, MS 39056
February 20, 1992

Thomas M. Chasen
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Chasen:

I am opposed to expansion of Camp Shelby in the
Do. Robt National Forest.

It is unnecessary and can do irreparable damage
to the environment.

Sincerely,
Mary Page

160:1

160:1 Comment noted. See response to comment 2:6 and 21:3. See general
misconception statements 5, 9, and 17.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Barbara Parker

161:1 Comment noted. The discussions on the impacts to wildlife in Section 3.3.2.4.1 have been revised to address in greater depth possible effects to the bird community at Camp Shelby. See also the response to comments 2:132 and 21:3 and misconception 5.

161:1

Feb 7, 1992
Dear Mr. Caren,
As a member of the Audubon Society, I am concerned about the impact on the bird population if there is any increase in the tank warfare at Camp Shelby into the Desoto National Forest lands. Any habitat alterations will certainly affect the birds.
Sincerely,
Barbara Parker, Ph.D.
Hattie's Den

From North American Bird Photo Records. © 1992 by the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia.

Mr. Tom Caren
Mobile District, Corp of Engineers
CESAM-PD-EI
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile AL 36628

10 FEB 1992

Postmark: "ABCD" "BETTER BIRD LIFE" with a bird illustration.

Postmark: "FEB 7 1992" with a circular design.

Great Egret (Casmerodius albus). Photograph by Eugene Hester/VIREO.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Vernon Patterson

162:1 Comment noted.

162:2 Comment noted.

March 18, 1992

Vernon R. Patterson JR
P O Box 704
Beaumont, MS 39423

Mr Thomas M Craven, CESAM-PD-EI
Corps of Engineers, Mobile District
P O Box 2288
Mobile AL 36628-0001

Mr Craven:


First of all, I would like to say that I am definitely for the EIS Land Special Use Permit for Camp Shelby, MS. I am a 30 year old member of the Volunteer Fire Department and employed as a state employee at Camp Shelby, MS.

I love nature and animals and I would like to protect them as much as the next person, but I want to see progress for the State of Mississippi and the only way to do that is to forge ahead with productive ideas such as the Special Use Permit. Camp Shelby has and will continue to refurbish land that is used for training in order to make it habitable for wildlife. Camp Shelby land is already well known for its abundance of wild game and habitat.

I was raised in Perry County - Beaumont, MS. My family and I still reside there and we are all very much supportive of the Camp Shelby EIS Special Use Permit.

Thank you for taking the time to read my letter.

Sincerely,



Vernon R Patterson JR

162:1

162:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Oscar Paulson

RESPONSE TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

ON MILITARY TRAINING USE OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS, CAMP SHELBY, MISSISSIPPI

BY

DR. OSCAR PAULSON

The statement under 2.3.3 Landforms, that "The elevation range between the ridges and valleys of the larger streams averages approximately 50 feet" appears to be at variance with my examination of the topographic map which provides me with a figure of approximately 90 feet for the relief along the larger streams.

The section 2.3.2.2 Effects of noise on wildlife and the preceding section 2.3.2.1 refer to Figure 2-3 and Appendix I which indicate that according to ICUZ Program that a noise level of less than 62 decibels is acceptable. However, studies by the Canadian National Research Council have shown that some people awaken more than 50 percent of the time at a noise level of 50 decibels. Jacksonville, Florida has a city ordinance which restricts noise in hospital and school areas to 50 decibels and in residential areas to 65 decibels during the day and 55 decibels at night. Dr. Douglas Hamm, poultry scientist, has shown that air-ground military maneuvers in North Carolina resulted in excitation of poultry and decline of egg production. Since it is widely accepted that noise has adverse effects on humans such as sleep deprivation, blood pressure rise, increased adrenalin in blood and stress, it would seem to be desirable to monitor the health of at least newer residents of the surrounding area.

Section 2.4.5.1.1 on the Red Cockaded Woodpecker blames the decline in this endangered species from 15 colonies to none on timber management practices (or perhaps lack of same). However, Section 3.5.6 indicates that suitable habitats exist for this species but the decline has continued. I do not understand these apparently contradictory statements but would like to know if and when correct timber management practices will be instituted; who has been responsible for monitoring this endangered species as outlined in CFR 36 219; and will this area be re-stocked and monitored to determine the effects which army maneuvers/training have on these colonies. It is interesting to note that the nesting season for this species appears to coincide with the heavy usage of facilities at Camp Shelby which may account for the decline in species.

Appendix H on Groundwater Drawdown Analyses for Camp Shelby states that much of the information is based on the old MGS report of 1944 and probably accounts for the fact that transmissibility is higher than that contained in a 1966 report. The drawdown Table 2 of page H-4 is based on a 12-inch diameter well and the well cited on page H-5 (well #1) refers to this table when, in fact, well no. 1 at Camp Shelby has a 10-inch diameter as do 14 of the 18 wells located there.

163:1 Comment noted. The text has been updated.

163:2 Comment noted. The ICUZ model considers that C-weighted, average day-night noise levels below 62 dB are generally acceptable for most land uses. Intrusive noise in a very quiet background may cause a "startle" effect at much lower levels. Within the ICUZ model, noises between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. incur a 10 dB penalty, which is an allowance for this effect. Please also see response to comment 21:4.

163:3 Comment noted. Section 2.4.5.1.1 of the Final EIS discusses the status of the RCW both in general and on Camp Shelby. Preparers acknowledge the original wording could be misinterpreted. The timber management practices referred to were region-wide on both public and private lands between 1900 and 1970, i.e. prior to the listing of the RCW. The Forest Service has assumed significant responsibility for RCW research, protection, and habitat management since the bird received listing as endangered in 1970 (prior to the Endangered Species Act of 1973). The Forest Service Wildlife Management Handbook was amended in 1975 to include a chapter on RCW management. Most of the significant remaining populations of the RCW now occur on National Forest and Department of Defense lands.

The Forest Service has been modifying timber management practices since the RCW was listed as an endangered species. The degree of modification has increased as the knowledge gained from research became available and incorporated into management guidelines. The Forest Service monitors RCW active and inactive colonies annually for nesting activity, use, population, etc. There are no plans to re-stock inactive colonies with birds. Experimentation with this is on-going in other places and has had very limited success. Additional information on the RCW may be found in the response to comments 14:16, 14:22, 14:23, and 14:24.

163:4 Comment noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Mrs. Eula B. Pearce

Brooklyn, Ms
Feb 10 1982

13 FEB REC'D

To whom it may concern:
I enclose you will find some
real good clippings from the paper
which I hope you will read. I
don't think they should spend any
more on Camp Shelby. They are not
using the land they have (some
of it) They took 56 acres of my
land in 1986 and haven't used it
at all yet. It is terrible to be
here where you can see what
goes on. You can't sleep at night
for the noise, guns so loud, roar-
ing of trucks, "They waste lots".
They don't need to destroy what
The Forest Service have took
several years of hard work to
establish. We need to get rid of
Sonny Montgomery and some
more of those politicians. Sonny
has been there too long anyway.
All they want is their pay.

164:1

164:2

164:1

164:1 Comment noted. The land in question will not be used for tracked vehicle maneuver. This land is immediately adjacent to the Gopher Tortoise Refuge, located in Training Area 44, which was established in 1988. The land is currently used as an extension of the Refuge and is used for those training activities which are allowed in the Refuge. It is possible that other types of training could occur on this land in the future.

164:2 Comment noted. No increase in numbers of vehicles or weapons is proposed. Please also see response to comments 21:4 and 21:6.

2-

The first thing they did their year was to raise their salary so you see politicians are playing a big part in their future. I wish Camp Shelby was in some desert land!

I am 78 yrs old, and have had to put up with this, most of my life. Most all this is un-called for. They can do on less.

They have tanks up there that have never been used. And they throw away many things especially 4 wheel gas and such like.

Hope you can see fit to help us out here.

I live
next to
Camp
Shelby

Sincerely
Mrs. Eula S. Pearce

Newspaper articles attached to this letter
not reproduced in this FEIS.

10 FEB 1967

To Land Steal

I can speak for several people here, close to Camp Shelby where they are trying to steal our heritages. If these tanks are used it will tear down all the small trees and scar the large ones. It is a shame that after the U.S. Forest Service has ~~took~~ so much care of the trees and land such as keeping ^{the} fires out, setting out trees, spraying and maintaining every way possible to see it go into destruction. They are not seeing some of what they already have. They took several acres of my land about 50 years ago, and haven't used it at all yet. I am totally against the proposed reshaping of the training area within our Desoto National Forest also against the Clear

164:4

164:1

164:5

164:4 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 9.

Response to 164:1 two Pages Previous

164:5 See response to comment 74:2. See general misconception statement 9.

164:6 See response to comment 21:8 and misconception 15.

164:7 Comment noted. Please also see misconceptions 3 and 25.

Response to 164:2 three Pages Previous

2.

Cutting, there would not be any thing left for our children or Grandchildren

164:5

It will endanger The Natural Well being of Black Creek and over States only "Wilderness Area" The 14 mile stretch of Black Creek and it is very near the proposed site.

164:6

If this don't pass Camp Shelby will still be there, and people will not lose their jobs. It would be too good to be true. I wish Camp Shelby was in some Desert land of all the noise, "you can't sleep at night sometimes for the gun shooting. And the solid roar. If the bigger tanks were here it would be worse.

164:7

We have a choice: protect it now, or lose it forever.
Eula Mae Pearce, 32 First Fomer Rd
Brockton, ms. 39425

164:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Phil Lechner

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

Phil Lechner
387 Belvedere Circle
Biloxi, Mississippi 39531

My main concern is we are a property and home owner in
the Leaf River Management Area. And my main question is
that since we look like we're going to be in the buffer zone
area between sections one and two what the land value will
have if it takes place there. In other words, will the land
increase in value or decrease in value. And personally my
own opinion right now, I believe it would be a decrease in
value for what's going to happen with the tank maneuver
areas in both of those sections, and they will be running
through the buffer zone area there. So basically that is my
main comment. And I'd like to know what, you know, someone
else may think of that, maybe they could highlight that for
me.

And the other question I have is this soil context up
in that area is basically made up of sandy soil and clay
form-type soil. What's going to happen to the top layers of
the soil in these areas once the tanks -- it's clear cut,
the land is clear cut and the tanks make their ways over it,
you know. I think it's going to be a major soil erosion in
certain areas and that that could start damming up the
streams and the creeks around that area. That's it.

165:1 Comment noted. Please see the response to comment 51:14.

165:2 Comment noted. Minimization of soil loss has been a major focus of the
planning for this effort, and is discussed throughout the Final EIS. Please also see
response to comments 10:5 and 14:46.

165:1

165:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Gordon Pearce

166:1 Comment noted. No current proposal would block Highway 29 for significantly longer periods than now experienced for convoy crossing. See also the response to comment 2:20.

166:2 Comment noted. Ten counties (Forrest, George, Greene, Harrison, Jackson, Jones, Pearl River, Perry, Stone, and Wayne) receive De Soto National Forest receipts. The relative dollar amount these counties receive is based on the proportion of De Soto National Forest acreage held within the county. The 25% returns from timber sales on any land cleared for maneuver will be distributed in this same proportion. Each county will continue to benefit in the same proportion from all sales anywhere on the De Soto National Forest following selection of any alternative. Barring major changes in National Forest sale policy, which would affect the entire Southern region, it is anticipated that county returns will stabilize at pre-implementation levels due to increased growth and harvest on remaining acreages. Please also see response to comment 97:9.

166:3 In the past, Camp Shelby has worked closely with the Perry County Board of Supervisors to correct damages to culverts, bridges, and roads. Replacement of Cypress Creek Bridge on the Paret Tower Road is a project which was totally funded by the National Guard. See also the response to comment 51:6.

166:4 Comment noted. See the response to comment 21:3.

62 Paret Tower Rd.
Brooklyn, MS 39425
February 24, 1992

P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Thomas M. Craven

I oppose the land being used because 29 Highway will be closed a great part of the time. Children can't go to school.

Also, I oppose Camp Shelby using land because the land will be clear cut and the Perry County Schools can never get 25% of the timber sales. They are now getting 25% from the U. S. Forest Service. Trees will never be grown on what is clear cut and the rest will be thinned too much. If Camp Shelby expands the only county in Mississippi benefitting will be Forrest County. Perry County will lose.

I also oppose the land use because loggers can not haul logs on Highway 29 to the giant Georgia Pacific Mill at New Augusta.

I oppose expanding because Perry County roads are already used too much by the National Guard. Guard's have already broken bridges in and severely damaged black top roads. They didn't help pay for them.

Also, lots of wildlife will be disturbed or killed. Such as nesting of wild turkey in spring.

Sincerely

Gordon E. Pearce

Gordon E. Pearce

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Lois Anne Pearce

167:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:3 and misconceptions 5 and 9.

167:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 2:6, 21:7, and 53:4 and misconception 22.

167:1

167:2

Feb. 27, 1992

Dear Mr. Craven,

I am writing in opposition to expanded tank training in DeSoto National Forest. I am concerned about the damage to the surrounding environments and ecosystems it would cause. Also I question the need for this type of training in the light of the recent reductions in the military and the halted production on the M-1 tank.

Please discontinue these plans and leave DeSoto forest to the people to whom it belongs. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Lois Anne Pearce
330 Lakebend Dr.
Brandon, MS 39042

10 FEB 1992

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Violet Pearce

168:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 2:20,, 2:244, and 2:339.

168:2 Comment noted. See response to comments 21:4, 21:6, 51:3, 51:4 and 51:12.

Jan. 5, 1992

U.S. Corps of Engineers
Mobile District
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Al. 36628-0001
Attn: PD-EI Sam Caven

Dear Sir:

I am writing in regards to the Proposed Tank Training Area under consideration at Camp Shelby. My concern is... My Children.

I have two school-age children that have to travel over Highway 29 every day to go to school. From the map that I've seen, one of the Tank Training Areas is on Hwy. 29. Would anyone want their children to pass through a tank training area?

I certainly do not. Even then, they may have a given time to train, my children have extra-curricular activities at school, and do not travel Hwy. 29 at a given time. Also, according to this same map,

(page 1 of 2)

168:1

168:2

the area will be behind Perry Central High School, where my children attend school. What kind of an education will children get if tanks are training in the area? How safe will my children be at school? How safe will they be on the way to and from school? If these tanks use laser, will that affect them? I have written to the Corps before, but I haven't been given any answer. I am not real pleased that my children travel this road now, with all the signs stating that military sounds may be fired over the road. Can you imagine how concerned I'll be if tanks are firing at them & running toward them?

Sincerely,
Willet France
62 Parat Street Rd.
Brooklyn, MS 39425

(Page 2 of 3)

This letter also read verbatim for the court reporter at the January 9, 1992 Public Meeting at Hattiesburg, MS.

168:3 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 168:2.

168:4 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:20. See general misconception statement 20.

168:5 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:20.

168:2

168:3

168:4

168:5

P.S. After attending the Open Meeting in Hattiesburg on Jan. 9, 1992, I am more concerned than ever. I talked to several different people from the National Guard and everyone told me something different. In the EIS, Volume 1, November, 1991, Page 3-92, it states in part: "Mississippi Highway 29 be closed ~~was~~ to travel for many hours at a time; possibly for several days." Are my children supposed to be punished further by having to travel the Eight Mile Road and through Beaumont Lock to school? They are gone almost ten hours a day now to ride the bus and attend school. When they go to band camp during the summer months and have to be there at 7:00 a.m., even ten minutes means a lot.

168:1

Page 3

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Doris Pearson

2-18-72

169:1 Comment noted. See response to comments 21:2 and 21:5 and misconceptions 5 and 12.

169:2 Please see response to comment 21:6 and 21:4. Section 3.1.5 in the Final EIS is a discussion on the effects of noise on wildlife and the potential for noise effects on humans.

169:3 The need for National Guard training at Camp Shelby is examined in Section 1.1.2.3 of the Final EIS. Please also see responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31 and misconception 9.

169:4 Please see response to comments 21:7 and 53:4 and misconception 5.

169:5 See responses to comments 3:12, 17:5, and 74:2. See general misconception statement 9.

Dear Mr. McMan
I am against the
Military Taking over Des Moines
National Forest.
The timber would have to
be cut, the tanks would destroy
the timber and plants, I know
they say it won't but we
know it will.
The noise would be unbearable
for wildlife and people who
live nearby.
There is no need for
this distraction when we all
know Fort H. is for
military purposes.
The population of the M-1 tank
has been halved so we don't
need anymore training ground than
we already have.
The forest is destroyed
every year. It replaced by
belong to the people of the
Nation. Please don't let them
destroy it.
I have you
Doris Pearson

February 24, 1992

Mr. Thomas M. Craven
Mobile District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers CESAM-PD-EI
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Re: My Comments on the Draft EIS

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am opposed to the expansion of tank training in the DeSoto National Forest. I support Alternative 6 of the Draft EIS, the alternative that will stop reissuance of the National Guard's Special Use Permit altogether, not allowing any further tank training at Camp Shelby.

The National Guard seeks to expand tank training into additional areas of the DeSoto National Forest, including the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area, at a time when the role of the National Guard armored brigades in wartime is in question. A General Accounting Office investigation found serious deficiencies in the brigades activated during the Gulf War and none of the deficiencies indicated a need for more training space.

According to the current issue of *Environmental News* (Vol. 11, No. 4, Feb. 1992), the Mississippi Army National Guard Camp Shelby Training Site currently has a \$1000.00 penalty levied against them by the Commission on Environmental Quality for not complying with Mississippi's hazardous waste management regulations. It seems unwise to trust that those who do not comply with our state's hazardous waste laws will care for rare plants and animals and delicate ecosystems.

Noisy military aircraft already disturb the peace of many of us who live far from Camp Shelby. Certainly the quality of life for those who live close by will be diminished by the expansion of tank training. There are many, many reasons for opposing the National Guard effort to take the DeSoto National Forest away from this and succeeding generations.

Sincerely,

Mrs. T.W. Perrott

Mrs. T.W. Perrott

170:1 Comment noted. Please see misconceptions 2, 5, and 8.

170:2 Preparers interpret the deficiencies as pointing strongly to a shortage of realistic training capability, including the ability to perform tank gunnery concurrent with maneuver. This shortfall is presented in Section 1.1.2.1 of the Final EIS. See also the response to comment 2:6.

170:3 Comment noted. In July of 1991, United States Environmental Protection Agency conducted a hazardous waste management inspection at Camp Shelby, MS. They found the following deficiencies: 1) Weekly inspections were not documented for two weeks at the less than 90 day storage area. 2) A container at Combined Support Maintenance Site did not have the word "waste" marked on it. 3) Some personnel had not received the appropriate hazardous waste training. Also, not all personnel had their hazardous waste duties listed in their job description or they had not been updated. All areas involved labeling and record-keeping requirements, and no release or improper disposal was involved.

The Mississippi Army National Guard (MSARNG) subsequently agreed to an order from the Mississippi Commission on Environmental Quality. This consent order required the MSARNG to correct all deficiencies noted during the July inspection or be fined \$1000.00. All deficiencies were subsequently corrected.

On March 11, 1992, an inspection of the Camp Shelby Training Site by the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality and the United States Environmental Protection Agency was conducted and no violations were noted. The inspection record indicated, "Camp Shelby staff are to be commended for correcting prior problems observed at the facility. Training records and manifests were easily reviewed during this inspection. All satellite storage areas and the 90-day storage area were well maintained. Each shop had an assigned hazardous waste coordinator who was doing an excellent job of managing the wastes generated." A joint inspection by EPA Region IV and the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality in April, 1993, found no violations of hazardous waste regulations at Camp Shelby.

170:4 Comment noted. No overall increase in numbers or usage levels of either tanks or aircraft is proposed. Concerns about noise have been a major focus of both the Draft and Final EIS (Section 3.1.5). See also the response to comments 21:4 and 21:6 and general misconception statements 12 and 13.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Zack Phillips

MR. THOMAS M. CRAVEN,

I AM WAITING YOU THIS LETTER CONCERNING
THE DESOTO NATIONAL FOREST "LAND SWAP."

I RECENTLY BOUGHT 10 ACRES OF LAND THAT JOINS
THE NATIONAL FOREST IN THE BROOKLYN AREA.
WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF BUILDING A HOUSE ON
THIS LAND. WE PRESENTLY LIVE IN HATTIESBURG
UNTIL THE HOUSE IS FINISHED. THE PURPOSE OF
MOVING FROM HATTIESBURG TO BROOKLYN IS TO GET
AWAY FROM NOISY STREETS AND CROWDED NEIGHBORHOODS,
TO ENJOY THE PEACE AND QUIET OF MOTHER NATURE,
NOT TO HEAR 60 TON TANKS PLAYING BEHIND OUR
HOUSE. ME AND THOUSANDS OF OTHERS HAVE ALWAYS
ENJOYED PEACEFULNESS OF THE NATIONAL FOREST,
AND WOULD LIKE TO SEE MY KIDS GROW UP TO ENJOY
THE BEAUTY OF THIS FOREST LAND. IF TANK
TRAINING IS CARRIED INTO THE DESOTO NATIONAL
FOREST, MOST OF IT WILL BE DEMOLISHED. IT'S
JUST NOT WORTH IT.
PLEASE CHECK ME A VOTE AGAINST THE
"LAND STEAL".

THANK YOU,
ZACK PHILLIPS

171:1 Comment noted. There are no proposals which will significantly increase the numbers of tanks which maneuver on Camp Shelby.

171:2 See response to comment 3:12, 17:5, and 51:2. See general misconception statements 5, 9, and 12.

171:1

171:2

February 29, 1992

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
John D. Pickering et al.

172:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 2:6 and 17:8. Please also see general misconception statement number 5.

U. S. Army Corp of Engineers
Mobile District
P.O. Box 2288
Attention: P.P. - E.I., Tom Craven
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven,

This is to express our strong support for the Camp Shelby land in Mississippi to be used for the training of our military in the use of M-1 tanks.

It was clearly obvious that some of our military units were not ready for combat during the recent Desert Storm. The 155th Armored Brigade is one example of not being adequately prepared. There are others.

We strongly believe that our freedom is worth far more than a few acres of land. We also believe that no man should be sent into combat without adequate preparedness.

To those who object to the use of this land for maneuvers then we say to them that they should be the first to volunteer the next time we face Saddam Hussein. And, that won't be a long time off.

Full steam ahead to the expansion of Camp Shelby for the use of land by the military to train our men adequately.

God Bless America!

Sincerely,
John D. Pickering

John D. Pickering
11 Clinic Road
Hattiesburg, MS 39402

Col. DeWanda, 1622 Willard St Jackson, MS 39211
Pauline Derington, 1622 Willard St Jackson, MS 39211
Lt. B. Harman, 1141 Wilbur Jackson, MS 39211
Col. Harman, 1641 Wilbur Jackson, MS 39211
Lt. B. Harman, Box 426 H. J. Harman, MS 39209
Letta, 1141 Wilbur Jackson, H. Harman, MS 39208

Page 1 of 2

Donna Ethridge, Rt. 7, Box 4524, Florence, MS 39073
Chip Dunnington 5555 Hwy 80 E, Pearl, Ms. 39208
Blonna Dunnington 5555 Hwy 80 E, Pearl, Ms. 39208
Dan Dunnington 629 Cedar Springs Dr. Jackson, MS 39212
Cecilia Dunnington 629 Cedar Springs Jackson, MS 39212
Haley D. Emmons 1639 Oak St. Hattiesburg, MS 39208
Dye Plenton, 1619 Wilkerson, Jackson, MS 39211
Charles Plenton - "

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Hart Pillow

173:1 Comment noted. See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31,

173:2 See response to comment 21:5 and 21:2.

173:3 Comment Noted. Please refer to Misconception 5, 15, and 16, and responses to comments 14:28, 21:8, and 102:5. Please also see the revised discussion of the ITAM program in section 3.4.1 of the FEIS.

173:4 Comment noted. No added firing of weapons is proposed in any alternative, and no firing into any area other than the present impact area is proposed. Please also see response to comments 21:4 and 7:13. See general misconception statement 13.

173:5 Comment noted. The continuous maintenance of training areas is the only means to maintain their usefulness. Without such care, conditions of the soil and vegetation groundcover will become unacceptably degraded, even for tracked vehicle maneuvers. See response to comments 7:4, 7:17, 7:24, 10:5 and 14:46.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

<p>Name: <u>Hart Pillow</u></p> <p>Address: <u>110 Sis Circle</u></p> <p>City: <u>Hattiesburg, MS. 39402</u></p> <p>State: <u>MS</u> Zip: <u>39402</u></p>		<p>Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992</p>
COMMENT QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>I am concerned that the National Guard is requesting and to do maneuvers that our National Defense Policy does not support. Has the Dept. of Army been contacted regarding the roles of Nat. Guard & the Army?</p>		
COMMENT QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>I believe that if proposal #1 is selected, timber and wood products will be negatively impacted, therefore depressing the local economy.</p>		
COMMENT QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>I am concerned that the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area will be reduced so that citizens cannot enjoy the area for hunting, hiking, camping, etc.</p>		
COMMENT QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>I do not want to add more problems of pollution to our local area, such as air and noise pollution, as well as the pollution left from the explosives.</p>		
COMMENT QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>I question the wisdom of tearing up roads for maneuvers and then building them back to be torn up again. What is the cost to do this?</p>		

110 Six Circle
Hattiesburg, MS. 39402
Feb. 29, 1992

Mobile Dist. US Army Corps
of Engineers CESAM-PO-ET
Attn: Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Ala. 36628-001

Dear Mr. Craven,

I respectfully share my thinking with you in the Camp Shelby land expansion proposal.

From what I have read, I do not see the need for more training space. The shortcoming cited by the GAO after the Gulf War did not relate to more training space or lack of training in those kinds of maneuvers.

I see a need to preserve the areas like the Desoto National Forest from unneeded destruction.

P.S. I ~~oppose~~ alternative #1. Sincerely,
I ~~support~~ alternative 3B. Hart Pillow

173:6 Comment noted. See response to comment 2:6 and misconception 8.

173:7 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 9 and 17.

173:8 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 1:4 and 1:33 and misconception 7.

173:6

173:7

173:8

24 JAN 1992

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Thomas Pitts

January 22, 1992

Thomas Pitts
341 McCaughan Avenue
Long Beach, MS 39560

Home: 601-864-5328
Work: 601-865-4698/4681

Thomas M. Craven
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District
Mobile, AL

Sir:

In reference to the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) of Camp Shelby's request for an extension of their special use permit (SUP) in the DeSoto National Forest, I will not attempt to address the entire study. I have, however, selected in my opinion specific's of the study that I feel, as being prevalent in regards to the study and its conclusion that there is/has been a substantiated need for the development of the DeSoto National Forest into a Tank Battalion Training Facility with No Significant Impact.

Mr. Craven, the Pinon Canyon landswap issue brought out many, many innuendos with overwhelming evidence of underhandedness on the part of our governmental agencies and our political representatives.

We now are seeing the exact same scenario being incorporated into the just released (DEIS) and (SUP) by the Army National Guard in the form of six alternatives incorporated into the study, three (3) of which gives the Army National Guard everything they wanted to do with the DeSoto National Forest in the beginning of this issue with the exception of not requesting ownership at this time.

The (DEIS) is a bogus study alone, to allow the (SUP) request to include alternative's stipulating the use/expansion into areas of the DeSoto National Forest not here-to-fore/previously used by the Mississippi National Guard for tank training.

Under the master agreement between the Departments of Defense/Agriculture (DOD)/(DOA) it is mandated along with the analysis and determination (of the suitability of public land(s) for military use, a substantiated need has to be evident with other DOD land(s) unsuitable and/or unavailable prior to the requesting of additional national forest lands for any type military training. The master agreement and it's guidelines condemns alternatives one (1), two (2), three-A (3-A) and three-B (3-B) and the construction of the Tank Table incorporated into alternative four (4).

The Army National Guard's preferred alternative, one (1) | 174:2

174:1 Comment noted. Please also see responses to comments 2:31 and 2:6.

174:2 Comment Noted. Please refer to Misconception 14 and response to comments 3:12, 16:2, 17:5, 38:3, 50:4, and 53:2.

174:3 The acreages cited represent the study area, not the area upon which tracked vehicle maneuvers will be conducted. See Tables 1-3 and 1-4, Section 1.2.1 of the Final EIS.

174:4 Comment noted. Please see Sections 3.3.2.3.1, 3.5.4, and 3.5.10.2 of the Final EIS and the response to comments 3:12 and 17:5.

174:5 Comment noted. Please see the response to comments 10:5, 14:46, 50:4, 88:3 and 97:10.

174:6 Comment noted. The Final EIS represents a continuing effort to remove conclusions and recommendations in sections where they are not appropriate.

174:7 Comment noted.

174:8 This is now included in the description of the geology of the area (Section 2.3.2.3).

174:9 The Final EIS contains a representation of the flight paths and a noise analysis for the Air National Guard aircraft. See Sections 2.3.2.3 and 3.1.5.2 and Figure 2-3B.

174:2

stipulates the reconfiguring/destruction of 75%/80% of the Leaf River management area by tank training (DEIS, Vol. I, pgs. 3-73).

The proposed tank management areas will encompass 39,772 acres of which the majority 36,349 acres, has not previously been used for tank maneuvers. (DEIS, Vol. I, pgs. 1-21).

174:3

In accordance with the (DEIS) and it's description of the proposed new tank battalion training area, 21,217 acres will require the cutting of the DeSoto National Forest. Sixty-six percent (66%) of this acreage, 14,105 acres is to be clear cut and the remaining thirty-three percent (33%), 7,112 acres to be thinned. This results in the removal of over 77 million board feet of timber resource from our public lands. (DEIS, Vol. I, pgs. 3-72 and 3-78)

174:4

Mr. Craven, how can the above represent No Significant Impact?

Mr. Craven, there's no way the rutting/water erosion can/will be controlled during the actual training periods!

Mr. Craven, once the soil had begun to erode the topsoil goes with the water run-off. You can't replace this with grass, sir! Neither can you prevent the sediments from washing into the branches/streams and wetlands of which all eventually drain into the Black Creek and find their way into the Mississippi Sound.

174:5

Sir, No Significant Impact?

The (DEIS) contains verbal hints/innuendos of possible concurrences/conclusions of which these statements represent very inappropriate/unnecessary comments related to the true purpose of the (EIS) process/study of which could be conceived as intimidating/offensive. (DEIS, exc. summary, pg. 4-ES-2) (DEIS, Recommendations/conclusions, Chapter 4, pgs. 4-1/4-15)

174:6

The (DEIS) bibliography is not on the whole applicable/conducive data relevant to assessing and/or reaching valid conclusions in reference to the environment/soil and animal behaviors in the DeSoto National Forest. (DEIS, Vol. I, Chapter 5, pgs 5-1/5-10)

174:7

Mr. Craven, why was the Cypress Creek Salt dome excluded from the geographical study?

174:8

Mr. Craven, why wasn't the altitudes/aerial-nautical speeds and flight paths to the Air National Guard firing range above Forest Road 303 not incorporated into this (DEIS) study, as requested by myself in my last verbal/written comments. (January, 1990)

174:9

174:10 The mailing list was developed from public announcements and advertisements throughout the area. This is presented in Appendix F.

174:11 The tactical aviation areas have been re-examined and re-sited in the Final EIS. See Sections 1.3.5 and 3.3.5.2 of the Final EIS. There is no proposed change in the number of helicopters which will use the area.

174:12 See response to comment 2:6.

174:13 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 10:1 and 63:5.

174:14 Comment noted. Planned mitigation and monitoring measures will minimize or eliminate many of the effects you are concerned about. See the discussion of proposed mitigation in Section 3.4 and of monitoring in Section 3.4.6 of the Final EIS. See also the response to comment 174:2.

174:15 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 21:3 and misconceptions 9 and 17.

174:13

174:14

174:15

Mr. Craven, the recreational use study/questionnaire was/is not representative of those who actually use the DeSoto National Forest. The survey mailing list was only derived from those who had registered at the scoping hearing during the landswap/exchange meetings.

Mr. Craven, the tactical maneuver areas have been given little recognition. However, with their development, would it be too speculative to envision more aircraft using this area? (helicopters to comply with the air/land training mission, as stated in the (DEIS), as the new Army National Guard mission) why wasn't this aspect given a low-key profile?

As a school administrator, I can fully appreciate the time/energies incorporated in this DEIS, however, the taxpayers have been shortchanged again, because of the failure to substantiate the need in the beginning for the development of a tank battalion training area.

Mr. Craven, I also am of the professional opinion that this study was conducted on a biased nature due to the inability of each of the two military factions involved in this (EIS) process (U.S. Army National Guard/U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) to diseminate themselves from a dedication and/or commitment to identical codes of comradery/support in regards to enhancing military achievements. In that respect, I reserve the right to totally disallow the entire study and it's conclusions - No Significant Impact!

Mr. Craven, the question arises, can the U.S. Army/Mississippi National Guard's request for a re-newal of it's (SUP) in the DeSoto National Forest be granted with an assurance of the maintenance of the forest ecosystem at the present and in regards to future considerations and/compliances within the guideline of the U.S. National Forest Service and under their strict supervision?

With so many special interest groups and individuals involved in the future care of our state's (Miss.) limited natural resources, I sincerely think it can!

However, in regards to all functional activities associated with the development of a tank battalion training area in the DeSoto National Forest, a special use permit cannot be issued under alternatives one (1), two (2), three-A (3-A)/three-B (3-B) an/or alternative four (4) without dire/irreversible consequences to the ecosystem/endangered species/wildlife and recreational use in the DeSoto National Forest.

In conclusion, it is the opinion of myself and many, many others that the destruction of over sixty-two (62)

This Page Intentionally Left Blank (Response to 174:15 on Previous Page)

square miles of our national forest lands cannot be construed | 174:15
as No Significant Impact.



Thomas Pitts

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Joann Pool

February 26, 1992

Thomas M. Craven
Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Sirs:

Here are some reasons to my opposition to expanded land training in DeSota National Forest.

1. There is less possibility of war due to the breakup of Communism in major countries.
2. U. S. is reducing the defense budget.
3. Less need for ground war, using tanks.

This DeSota is already a National Forest (preserved by the Federal Government) so it would be a breach of contract to use it for military purposes,

4. We need to preserve all of our natural resources, especially trees.
5. Trees are our natural filtering systems for polluted air and noise.
6. Loss of natural land, which modern man needs to keep in touch with nature.
7. Since it has taken years for these trees to become this majestic forest - it would be unforgiveable to wipe it out for mankind's apathy, greed and stupidity.

As you see, I do feel strongly about this issue. Congress in 1891 established the first Conservation of Forests policy, and we must continue to protect all of these areas.

A Very Concerned Citizen,

Joann W. Pool

Joann W. Pool
121 Woodglen Dr.
Gulfport, MS 39507

175:1 Comment noted. See responses to comments 2:6 and 21:7.

175:2 Comment noted. See response to comments 26:4, 28:3, and 30:2 and misconception 22.

175:3 Comment noted. Preparers note that vegetation is a psychological, but not physical barrier to noise. Please also see response to comments 14:47 and 35:27 and misconception 22.

175:4 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 3:12, 17:5, and 74:2.

175:5 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 175:2.

175:1

175:2

175:3

175:4

175:5

Responses begin on following page

Thomas L. Price
4110 Weatherston Road
Hattiesburg, MS 39402

February 22, 1992

Mr. Thomas Craven
Mobile District, COE
CESAM-PD-EI
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Tom,

I appreciate the chance to comment on the DEIS Military Training Use of National Forest Lands, Camp Shelby, MS.

My comments are in two parts. One deals with the proposed use and the second deals with the sex new facilities.

I compliment the team that put the DEIS together. You covered many areas of concern. My comments are directed at the short comings which I believe, if corrected, will give the decision makers better grounds on which to chose an alternative.

Sincerely,

Thomas L Price

Thomas L. Price
410 Weatherford Road
Hattiesburg, MS 39402

The following are my comments on the DEIS for military training use of National Forest lands at Camp Shelby, MS.

1. The master agreement between DOD AND DA concerning use of National Forest System Lands for military activity clearly states in I.C., III.A. and IV.A.1. "...the necessity of a determination by DOD that lands under its administration are unsuitable or unavailable." This determination is not in this DEIS. Please provide it.

2. If it is determined that the item stated in #1 is not needed because the DEIS covers a change of use and it is not a new use, please give a detailed explanation of how the new use is in conformity with the forest land management plan for the Black Creek Ranger District, DeSoto National Forest as required in I.C. of the master agreement.

3. Please state the mission, goal and objectives of the Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks for the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area and how alternative 1 and 2 affect their ability to carry out their mission.

4. Forest Service Manual 1922.5 calls for amendment of the Forest Plan when a use is not consistent with the Forest Plan. The number of acres, volume of timber, impact to soils, water and recreation resources are of such a nature and extent in this proposed use to markedly affect the flow of goods and services from the National Forest. Therefore an analysis of the impact to the forest plan needs to be developed for each alternative in order for the decision maker to have adequate information upon which to make a decision.

176:1 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 2:31.

176:2 See additional coverage in Sections 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 of the Final EIS.

The Forest Plan is planned for revision within the next two years. At that time the effects of the Special Use Permit (SUP) on the output of goods and services will be considered. The cumulative effects on the environment from activities allowed under the SUP and the various plan alternatives will also be disclosed.

176:3 The history of and level of management activities on the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area comprise a major addition to the Final EIS. The nature of present activities is such that effects are not projected to be major. See Sections 2.4.6, 3.1.6, 3.3.6, and 3.5.12 of the Final EIS.

176:1

176:2

176:3

176:2

5. Wildfire prevention and control is a major concern of the DeSoto National Forest. The occurrence of wildfires caused by military activities is about 25% of the fires and 75% of the acres burned annually. The repeated burning in ranges and impact areas has a adverse effect to forest soils, erosion, wildlife habitat and other resources. There is no analysis of wildfire in the DEIS. please provide such an analysis.

176:4

6. The use of pesticides by the National Guard on Forest Service lands is not covered in this DEIS. It is inadequate to say that the National Guard will follow the Forest Service Vegetation Management EIS. Of course the National Guard will but what is the extent, nature, purpose for pesticide use and what are the alternatives to use. Please cover this issue in the EIS.

176:5

7. Some track vehicles and support aircraft used at Camp Shelby are capable of firing depleted uranium cored projectiles. Are any such projectiles planned in this action? Have any been used in the past? What are the human health and safety issues with the use of this material? What are the human and environmental risks if this material is in an impact area? Please discuss this in the EIS.

176:6

8. I tried to find water quality monitoring in the index. It is not there. I tried to find it under surface water. The only reference to surface water is 4-8. On page 4-8 there is no caption for surface water. Monitoring is not in the index but clearly is on page 3-113. Please improve the 8.0 Index so it is usable before the EIS is produced.

176:7

9. Water quality monitoring is proposed at five sites. Surface water is potentially affected by each alternative. Please discuss water quality monitoring for each of the alternatives. There is no monitoring for heavy metal ions or

176:8

176:4 The discussion of the place of wildfire and controlled burning has been amplified in the Final EIS. Please see response to comments 1:41, 14:37 and Appendix U.

176:5 Use of herbicides and insecticides within the permit area is controlled by both Forest Service and Army regulations. See Appendix V and response to comment 57:16.

176:6 See general misconception statement 13. See also response to comment 14:31.

176:7 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 20:6.

176:8 The examination of water quality monitoring has been expanded. Please see Sections 3.2.2, 3.4.4.3, 3.4.6.2, and 3.5.3.1 of the Final EIS and response to comments 20:5 and 20:6.

aromatic hydrocarbons. Please explain. There is no monitoring proposed at the discharge sites for the automatic tank wash facility. There should be because of the potential for sediment and contaminants entering surface water. Please discuss in the EIS.

176:8

10. The Mississippi Bureau of Pollution Control had determined that Camp Shelby is a large quantity hazardous waste generator. Their report in Appendix D deals with the Explosive Ordnance Detachment. Please explain why the exploded and non-exploded ordnance in the impact area is not considered a hazardous waste.

176:10

11. There is comment in the DEIS about modifying training and firing schedules for deer hunting season. Please document the various deer seasons, turkey seasons and other game bird seasons. Then compare them with training and firing schedules. If training and firing schedules conflict with any game open season, please tell what modification is planned to accommodate the hunting public.

176:11

12. The law governing Forest Service operation requires that 25% of gross receipts be returned to the counties and that 10% of gross receipts go to the Forest Highway Fund. The National Guard use of the National Forest has resulted in many acres not producing any revenue from timber production. Please document this loss of revenue to counties and Forest Road Funds for acres taken out of timber production for training area, ranges and in the impact area. Please explain what mitigation measures the National Guard plans to correct this matter.

176:12

13. Since the economy and the personnel payroll at Camp Shelby is an important concern for this area, please provide an analysis of how many people would lose their jobs, how many dollars in salaries would be lost in each alternative.

176:13

176:9 The MSARNG will comply with regulatory requirements for monitoring all discharge sites. To discharge the effluent from a Tank Wash Facility to either the waters of the State of Mississippi or the Camp Shelby Training Site Waste Water Treatment Plant, the Mississippi Army National Guard (MSARNG) will be required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit from the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality. That permit will contain effluent concentration limits, operational requirements and discharge monitoring requirements. Camp Shelby will be required to conduct compliance monitoring sampling in addition to the sampling done by the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality to assure compliance with permit limits.

176:10 See response to comment 14:35.

176:11 Current and proposed tank training schedules do not conflict with the deer, turkey or other game-bird seasons. See Section 3.3.3.4 and Appendix F of the Final EIS and response to comment 102:5 and misconceptions 4, 9, and 19.

176:12 See response to comments 97:9 and 166:2.

176:13 Alternatives 1, 2, 3A, and 4 do not project changes in employment except for short term construction-related work. See Section 3.3.4.1 of the Final EIS.

Alternative 3B cannot be selected because of conflict with the Biological Opinion from the Fish and Wildlife Service on the gopher tortoise.

Alternative 5: With this alternative there would be no tracked maneuver areas. This would reduce the number of road and rehabilitation workers. However, the increase in range personnel to operate the MPRC-H and updated Tank Table VIII would approximately offset this loss.

Alternative 6: Under this option, all military training would be stopped. (Section 3.3.4.1.) Over 700 permanent and seasonal employees would lose their jobs. Lost salaries would be \$18,050,000.00. Also, lost would be the dollars spent by the 130,000 plus military personnel training annually at Camp Shelby.

Economic benefit has not been used by the proponent as a basis for the action. Please also see Section 1.1.2 of the Final EIS and misconceptions 3 and 25.

W. J. L. F. Jr.
4100 Independence Blvd.
Raleigh, NC 27602

14. What effect does this action have on the mobilization role of Camp Shelby? What effect will mobilization have on the annual training and weekend training at Camp Shelby?

176:14

15. The role of National Guard combat units is in question in the news and by Secretary of Defense Cheney. The CAO report alluded to the skill and training level of units that train at Camp Shelby. Before action is taken on this DEIS a clear role of the National Guard in the future is essential.

176:15

16. I am participation with the DeSoto National Forest in a program called Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) for the wild and scenic river and the wilderness area. I find no mention of LAC in the DEIS. Please discuss this deficiency in the final EIS.

176:16

17. The longleaf pine ecosystem is ~~permanently~~ ^{seriously} depleted in its original range. The DeSoto National Forest may be one of the last major holdings of longleaf pine. Table 3-20 does not separate the longleaf species. Please provide this information and discuss the loss of longleaf pine ecosystems in each alter native.

176:17

18. What do you plan to do about noise from military activities and the negative impact it has on the wild and scenic river and wilderness users.

176:18

19. Noise levels for aircraft and helicopters greatly affect the local population, the peace and tranquility of the wild and scenic river and the wilderness area. Please study these additional noise sources and their effect in the EIS.

176:19

20. Since the current budget and logistics allows 20% of the area needing soil stabilization to go untreated now, please

4.

176:14 Part One: CSTS is tasked by the National Guard Bureau (NGB) to perform two missions: First, as an Annual Training Site (the nation's largest), CSTS provides facilities and support for units training here (AT and WET). Second, CSTS serves as a Mobilization Station in the event of war or other national emergency (a mission we performed during Operation Desert Storm). CSTS is, in fact, a State Owned Mobilization Station (SOMS). CSTS is a Category A (largest) Mobilization Training Area as well as a SOMS. CSTS is the nation's largest SOMS and the nation's largest National Guard and Army Reserve Training Center (over 143,000 personnel in TY 91). (See also DEIS, Vol II, App C, Pg C-7 thru C-9). In the event of full mobilization, CSTS is scheduled to mobilize over 22,000 troops from 3 Armored Brigades, an Armored Cavalry Squadron and various support units. These units store their equipment at the CSTS-MATES (over 4 billion dollars worth) and routinely train on this equipment during AT and WET. The majority of training time for these units is spent in preparation for mobilization.

Part Two: If world events prompted Congress to mobilize all ARNG/USAR Troops (Full Mobilization), Camp Shelby could be federalized, thus becoming an active army post. If this occurred, CSTS would no longer be classified as an Annual Training Site and therefore host no AT or WET. Selective mobilization is much more likely than full mobilization in the current world setting. During Operation Desert Storm, Congress called for a selective mobilization for only certain units and/or duty positions. This set a precedent for future call-ups. In fact, as a result of ODS, all mobilization plans are currently being re-written

Even during selective mobilization, CSTS would most likely continue to serve as an Annual Training Site. During the De-Mobilization period following Operation Desert Storm, CSTS continued providing support for annual and weekend training as well as processing units for de-mobilization. In light of this experience, it appears that, except for a major, national emergency, annual training and weekend training would continue to be supported. CSTS is the Mob Station for these units equipment and serves as their Annual Training Site. If CSTS cannot provide the necessary training facilities/areas, these units will be forced to train elsewhere to meet training requirements. Obviously, if suitable training areas are not available at Camp Shelby, then the Department of the Army will relocate these units and re-assign their mobilization station. The loss of this mobilization mission and the resultant loss of troops/units attending AT and WET at CSTS will absolutely impact on employment at Camp Shelby.

176:15 See response to comment 2:6.

176:16 See response to comment 14:26.

176:17 See response to comment 1:10.

176:18 Noise effects on Black Creek and in the wilderness areas was identified in the LAC study referred to in Section 3.1.3.4. Section 3.1.5 discussed current noise levels and Section 3.2.4 present mitigation measures. Section 3.3.5 notes that no significant changes are anticipated in either firing or aircraft noise. The noise contribution of aircraft was added to the noise discussions throughout the Final EIS.

176:19 See response to comment 7:4.

176:20 Comment noted. Please see responses to comments 10:5 and 14:46.

176:21 Comment noted. Please see Section 3.1.1.3.3 to the Final EIS and response to comment 14:37.

176:92 Please see the response to comments 7:4, 7:16, 7:17, and 7:24 with respect to funding, and the response to comments 10:5 and 14:46 with respect to erosion control measures.

provide plans and financial resource sources to correct this problem before any new activities are undertaken.

21. Since current soil and erosion corrective measures have not been funded in the past and since this action proposes to create more soil erosion problems, detail the source of funds and plans for restoration for each alternative for the expected life of this military use of National Forest land.

176:19

22. Range 50 is an excellent example of how construction projects should not be done. No effort was made to hold silt on site for nearly nine months after the site was cleared. There is currently sheet erosion on the site and silt leaving the site on the Eastern edge of the clearing. Please correct this matter. Please provide evidence that this type of destruction of the soil resource is not to be tolerated in any of the alternatives or facilities proposed in this DEIS.

176:20

23. Most of the examples of soil erosion for ranges, training areas and assembly areas contain references to existing problems. What specifically is being done to correct these problems?

24. In the impact area, fire is blamed for serious soil degradation. Please detail the fire prevention and control measures to be carried out for all military caused fires. All military caused fires in the impact area should be controlled before they reach one acre in size.

176:21

25. You say that gullies exist and the erosion is not now considered serious on ranges and tank assembly points. All erosion is serious and the off site damage is as serious as the on site damage. Please provide stronger assurances that funds and work priorities will be available to correct these problems. Please discuss and describe prevention of erosion in each alternative.

176:92

176:22 Records indicate only one condemnation action since 1980, and this was a "friendly" action performed at the request of the owner. Please also see response to comment 63:30.

176:23 See additional coverage in Section 3.5.10.1. and 3.5.10.2 of the Final EIS.

176:24 Commercial forest land in the five county economic area decreased between 1977 and 1987 by 61,800 acres or 4.2%. At the same time the acreage of sawtimber size material increased 20,100 acres or 3.9% and pulpwood size material increased 6,000 acres or 1.5%. Thus the acreage shortfall is in the seedling-sapling size class and won't effect timber supplies for about 20 years. 37,000 more acreage was under professional forest management in 1987 than in 1977. Timber stands established in the 60's and 70's as plantations are well stocked and should contribute higher per acre yields when harvested for sawtimber during the next 20-30 years. Thus the cumulative effect to the economic region of removing 10-20,000 acres from the managed land base is probably minor for the foreseeable future. See additional coverage in Section 3.5.4.

176:25 Commentor is correct, and this was a critical element in the site evaluation process, as described in Section 1.1.6 (and Figure 1-8) of the Final EIS.

176:26 Please see Sections 3.5.2.1 and 3.5.2.2 of the Final EIS.

176:27 The area required is stated, in TC 25-2, as the requirement for support for supporting the year-round needs of a full division. At Camp Shelby, the scheduling of units allows re-use of areas by successive units, minimizing the need for several different areas. Preparers note that only Alternative 1 will fully meet the needs for even brigade level training. See also Sections 1.2.2 through 1.2.7 of the Final EIS and the response to comment 17:8.

26. Camp Shelby, the DOA and the Corp of Engineers have an active and aggressive land acquisition program at Camp Shelby. Some of the acquisition has been by condemnation. Please provide a complete analysis of the past, present and future land acquisition activities at Camp Shelby.

27. The economic affect of Camp Shelby is real in the region. However to say it is one of the regions major economic forces with only 3.68 of the local sales volume, 2.45 of contributions to the employment and 1.72% contribution to income does not seem to support this. Please use the forest industry of this region as a basis for comparison. Evaluate the impact to the forest industry on local sales volume, employment and income given the loss of timber volume resulting from each alternative.

28. Please discuss the cumulative effects of all lands (roads, industrial parks, sub-divisions) removed from timber production in the five county region and the effects of each alternative in the DEIS.

29. Since soils are such a critical element in location of training sites, please provide a map of soils with their erodability characteristics for all areas of military training.

30. Since destruction of soil is greater when soils are wet, please detail what soil conditions must be present for training to be stopped to prevent damage.

31. The DA requires 64,256 acres of contiguous maneuver area according to the DEIS. Yet the NG has decided it can be done on 21,217 acres of net maneuver area in alternative 1. Please provide a definitive statement from DA that they will accept this reduction of standards. Please also provide the same statement for alternatives 2, 3A, 3B, and 4.

176:28 As discussed in Section 3.3.1.5, proponents recognize that structural supplementation will be required in many cases. The recommended buffer in the Final EIS is 100 feet. See Sections 3.4.2, 3.4.3.1, 3.4.5.1, and 3.4.5.2 of the Final EIS.

176:29 Comment noted. Wetland crossing designs are discussed in Section 3.4.5.3 of the Final EIS. The at-grade crossings are designed for the smallest crossings of intermittent streams. Larger streams and associated wetlands will be bridged. The site analyses described in Section 1.4 will include recommendations as to type of crossing improvement most appropriate when all elements, including wetland sensitivity, are evaluated.

176:30 See response to 176:13 and 2:242.

176:31 Comment noted. The purpose of an EIS is to disclose probable impacts to assist a decision maker to an informed decision. Because of changing management emphasis, development of new products, future role of the Forest Service, and other constraints on timber management; estimating sawtimber volumes at a hypothetical rotation would serve little purpose in assisting an informed decision. See response to comment 51:1.

176:32 See the response to comment 14:16.

32. You state that a 33 foot buffer is sufficient to prevent sediments from reaching wetlands and streams in most cases. What intensity and duration of storm is this based on? What slope is this based on? Please show the effectiveness of the 33 foot buffer for the most intense storm in the last five years and for the storm of longest duration in the last five years. Please show this evaluation of the 33 foot buffer on slopes of 3%, 5%, and 10% and the greatest slope that is expected to exist on each alternative in the DEIS.

176:28

33. Wetlands are extremely delicate and fragile ecosystems. Track vehicle crossings of wetlands are very destructive. Because of this, bridges should be the preferred method of crossing and at grade crossings the least preferred.

176:29

34. Alternative 6, No Action, says that a special use permit will not be issued for National Forest lands. You state that all military training and other functions at Camp Shelby would be stopped. Please list all the training and other functions at Camp Shelby by cantonment and operational areas, the number of personnel both military and civilian in each training and other function that would be affected and the dates you propose to "stop" such training and other functions, assuming alternative 6 is chosen and the effective date is 13/31/92.

176:30

35. In your timber volume summary you carry it out to 40 years. The DeSoto NF is on a sawtimber rotation forest management program. Please provide the data on volumes carried out to the end of one full rotation for all pine species and for longleaf pine.

176:31

36. Bird populations have declined in the southeast. Bird populations have decreased by 40% or more on military bases with training facilities similar to those proposed here. In order to better understand the effects of the actions in this DEIS and thus make a better decision, please quantify the forest habitat dwelling birds by specie and quantity in species and spell out the expected decline in these species and their number for each alternative and facility.

176:32

176:33 Not every effect of an action can be mitigated. Federal law does not provide for direct payments to counties in lieu of lost tax revenues. The Forest Service anticipates that county returns will stabilize at pre-implementation levels due to increased growth and harvest on remaining acreages. Refer to section 3.3.2.3.1.

176:34 See also response to comments 176:27 and 17:8.

176:35 See response to comments 2:6 and 16:7.

176:36 Appendix K is neither misleading nor untrue. There are three Armored Brigades, (The 30th, Tennessee; The 31st, Alabama and The 155th, Mississippi) and an Armored Cavalry Squadron, (The 108th from Mississippi.) Out of state tracked units train extensively at Camp Shelby to include the armor brigades of Tennessee and Alabama, and weekend utilization takes place.

These units not only train at Camp Shelby but will mobilize at Camp Shelby in the event of mobilization. Because Camp Shelby is the mobilization site for these units their equipment is stored at and maintained by the Camp Shelby Mobilization and Equipment Site (MATES).

37. During the scoping process an economic issue was " describe how lost timber revenue from proposed actions from schools and road budgets would be made up." This issue was submitted by 17 people. I find no coverage of this topic in the D.I.S. Please explain.

38. The Land Use Requirement Study (LURS) dated 10/18/90 is included as Appendix K. The original request for additional tank maneuver area of 32,000 acres was made by the National Guard in early 1989. Why was the LURS not completed prior to that request? Has a LURS been done for any other expansion at Camp Shelby, such as the consolidated tank maneuver area in 1983? If not, why not? When was LURS required by the Army for Camp Shelby? Was it required when TC 25-1 (8/4/78) was issued? Deficiency in training area is blamed for units not being prepared for Desert Shield/Storm, however the GAO report of September 1991 does not support this. Please explain this difference. Do out of Mississippi track vehicle units train on weekends at Camp Shelby or is it only the 155th? If only the 155th, your Appendix K is misleading or untrue. Please explain.

176:37 Portable toilets will be placed on a permanent pad. Because this area is on United States Forest Service (USFS) administered land and is open to the public, vandalism cannot be absolutely prevented.

176:38 Comment noted. Not all measurable effects are environmentally significant.

176:39 Comment noted. Impacts to wetlands of facilities projects are discussed in Section 3.3.1.5.1 of the Final EIS.

176:40 Comment noted. Preventive measures are discussed in Section 3.3.2.1.1 of the Final EIS.

176:41 Comment noted. The approximate value of 10 acres is now used in both locations.

176:42 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 176:29.

176:43 The Tank Table VII, Range 45 upgrade occurs in an area already considered unsuitable for timber management and contains little standing timber volume, and has been withdrawn from active management. Therefore it wasn't discussed relative to forestry.

The following are my comments and observations on the six facilities to be constructed.

1. Range 45 Automatic Tank Table VIII Project, section 1.3.1.

b. Page 1-44 calls for a latrine. It is not detailed in T-44. Is it portable or permanent? Will it be shot up like some of the portable ones are at Camp Shelby?	176:37
c. Page 3-44 (1.) You state "Will have no significant impact on soils." You state "Will have potential measurable effects on localized areas of soil." Why the inconsistency?	176:38
d. Page 3-67 (1.) You state "will require about 10 acres of wetland vegetation..." Yet in appendix T you show roads crossing in wetlands. Why do you ignore other wetland impacts in 3.2.1.5.1 Wetlands.	176:39
e. Page 3-69 (1.) and T-17. Land form change requires soil to be transferred from one place to another. Under any land form change, no silt should be allowed to leave the site and enter surrounding areas. This results in the potential loss of that habitat. Further, since water flows down hill, it carries silt into water courses. No silt off site applies to both cut and fill areas.	176:40
f. Page 3-74 (1.) In this section you cite "seven acres of forest." Is this wetland forest or general forest? If it is wetlands why is it inconsistent with the "ten acres of wetland vegetation." on page 3-67 and page T-26.	176:41
g. Page T-21. See my comment No. 33 on the DEIS for military training use.	176:42
h. Page 3-77 section 3.2.2.3. You do not discuss Range 45 ATT VIII project relation to forestry. Why?	176:43

Final EIS
Appendix 3
176:44-176:50

<p>i. Page 3-82 (1.) You state "...relatively minor timber removal (100 acres)," as having little additional impact on wildlife. Please discuss the cumulative effect of <u>all</u> acres cleared on wildlife habitat and the diversity of habitat needed for all manner of wildlife, both game and non game mammals and birds.</p>	176:44	<p>176:44 In the general discussion of the setting, five paragraphs above the section quoted, the environment is characterized as having only scattered trees of very small size. The "100 acres" thus does not represent an intact, forested setting. See the biodiversity, and T&E species coverage (Section 3.5) for a discussion of cumulative effects. Please also see Sections 3.3.2.4.2 and 3.3.2.5.2 and the response to comment 176:43.</p>
<p>j. Page 4-2 section 4.1.1.2. You state "...no significant effect." Yet in several sections in Chapter 3 and Appendix T you cite significant effects to land form, soils, wetlands and others. Why the inconsistency?</p>	176:45	<p>176:45 Commentor is correct. Communications and power cables will be laid underground to several target areas.</p>
<p>k. Page T-7 Section T.1. Will there be any trenching for power supply in wetlands?</p>	176:46	<p>176:47 Please see response to comments 176:21 and 14:37</p>
<p>l. Page T-12, Section T.3.1.2. Because of the effects of repeated wildfires on vegetation and subsequent soil loss, all military caused wildfires should be put out before they get to be one acre in size. Please analyze the number of military caused fires, acres burned, size class of fire, fire damage class on day of fire and rehabilitation of soil and vegetation following a fire.</p>	176:47	<p>176:48 Please see response to comments 10:5 and 14:46.</p>
<p>m. Page T-16, T.3.2.1.3. Because of the destructive effects on vegetation, habitat and surface water, no silt should leave the site of soil disturbance, regardless of the nature of the soil disturbance.</p>	176:48	<p>176:49 See response to your comment 176:47.</p>
<p>n. Page T-16, T.3.2.1.5. See comment m.</p>	176:49	<p>176:50 See Section 3.3.2.1.1 of the Final EIS and the response to comment 57:16.</p>
<p>o. Page T-17, T.3.2.1.6. See comment m.</p>		
<p>p. Page T-17, T.3.2.2.1. See comment m. There is a discussion of prescribed fire but there is no analysis of wildfire, its prevention and control. Please add this analysis.</p>		
<p>q. Page T-19 Use of Pesticides. Please discuss alternatives to the use of pesticides by the NG for this use. Please cross reference to the main document where use of pesticides for vegetation control is found.</p>	176:50	

176:51 Table 3-15 in Section 3.3.1.2 of the Final EIS contains these data.

176:52 Comment noted.

176:53 The combination of availability of maneuver training outside the tank main gun safety area with more efficient range facilities is projected to reduce the need for weekend tank gunnery training. The degree to which it will be able to do so depends on the skill level attained by crews, and no numeric estimate is available.

176:54 Figure 3-24 has been revised.

176:55 There are no losses of listed species projected.

176:56 The wording has been clarified.

176:57 Few landform changes are planned other than construction of required roads and trails.

176:58 Table 3-16 in Section 3.3.1.2 of the Final EIS contains these data.

176:59 Table 3-21 (Section 3.3.2.3) contains the comparison of the longleaf pine affected. See also the response to comment 1:10.

i. General- Please include and discuss the overall size of the project in acres. Acres to be cleared, acres to be reshaped for project needs and acres in all roads, barrow pits (on or off the project) and acres of improvements such as buildings, concrete, and parking lots.

s. General- The information presented in Appendix T does not seem to cover the environmental consequences of the project nor the corrective measures required. The data for a decision maker is inadequate.

2. Multiple Purpose Range Complex - Heavy. Section 1.3.2

b. Page 1-47. You state fewer requirements for firing on weekends. How much fewer? You state "...reducing the tank safety fan restrictions." How much reduction?

c. Page 3-56 and 3-57: Table 3-11 says there are five RCWCA in the alternative site. Figure 3-24 shown no boundary for RCW colony, nor does it delineate this RCWCB area. Please correct this.

d. Page 3-57. Please describe in detail the evaluation of soils, relief, wetlands and T and E species against each other so a decision maker can determine if the greater loss of soil and related off site deterioration and wetlands can be weighed against the T and E losses.

e. Page 3-44 and 3-57. You state "...less low potential soils." Please explain low potential for what?

f. Page 3-70 (2.) Please discuss how much land form change is required in each alternative.

g. Page 3-68 (2.) Why do you use 288 acres here and else where you use 266 acres. Which is correct?

h. Page 3-75 (2.) Longleaf pine ecosystem has been significantly reduced since settlement by European man throughout its range. Presently the greatest acreage of managed longleaf ecosystem is probably the DeSoto National Forest. Please

176:60 Records for the Bachman's sparrow and Eastern indigo snake shown in Figure 3-24 (DEIS) were obtained from the Mississippi Natural Heritage Program records. Bachman's sparrow was observed on eighteen (18) LCTA plots during the 1991 and 1992 spring LCTA song bird surveys. UTM coordinates and specific directions to the LCTA plots, dates, and the observers name can be obtained from the Camp Shelby LCTA coordinator, located at Camp Shelby. The indigo snake has not been observed during these studies.

176:61 See response to comment 176:45.

176:62 The text referred to has been corrected. While the *acreage* to be cleared is similar on both sites, the *volume* on the alternate site is about twice as great.

176:63 Impacts of fire on ranges is discussed in Sections 3.4.9.1. and 3.5.4.2 of the Final EIS.

176:64 Because of wildfire problems, some prescribed burning of ranges along with green vegetation strips is being experimented with. Prescribed burning as a regular practice isn't being proposed for this project.

176:65 As stated in Section 1.3.3 of the EIS, the proposed project has waste water recycling as a design feature. No regular added water or discharges are anticipated.

176:66 See response to comment 176:9.

176:59 analyze and include in the EIS the impact of further reduction of longleaf ecosystem between the 2 alternative sites for this project. Please justify the preferred alternative given. It takes nearly twice as much acreage from the Longleaf ecosystem.

176:60 i. Page 3-85. You bring up Bachman's Sparrow and the Eastern Indigo Snake. Please show the range through out Camp Shelby for these two species. Please furnish the documentation of sighting of each as to location, date and person.

176:61 j. Page 4-2, Section 4.1.1.2. Please explain "...no significant effect." on primary and alternate sites when there is extensive soil movement, land form change and T&E implications.

k. Page 4-2, section 4.1.1.2. You state that there is more construction work and timber cutting in the alternate site when compared to site one, yet Table 3-14 says the opposite. Please explain this inconsistency? A decision maker can not make a good decision with such confusing information.

176:62 l. Are there to be any power of communication facilities associated with this project? Where are they discussed?

m. Fire prevention and control of wildfires is not discussed relative to this project. Please analyze the military caused wildfire situation for this project.

176:63 n. If prescribed fire is to be a part of this project, where is the analysis for it?

176:64 3. Automatic Tank Washing Facility. Section 1.3.3.

176:65 b. Page 1-48. Water is a scarce resource and as such nothing less than total recycling of waste water is acceptable. Please detail the plan for total recycling of waste water.

176:66 The discharged treated effluent must meet discharge standards or be treated in the base water treatment facility. No discharge should get to either Davis of Hartfield Creek without meeting discharge standards. Please detail the monitoring plan to test discharge water.

176:67 Comment noted. Extensive additional coverage has been given to the issue of soil loss in the Final EIS. Final construction plans will use methods discussed in Sections 3.4.2 through 3.4.6.

176:68 Comment noted.

176:69 See response to comment 176:67.

176:70 See response to comment 176:62.

176:71 See response to comment 14:35.

176:72 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 176:67.

176:73 The Mississippi Army National Guard (MSARNG) recently contracted for analyses to determine the effects of explosives on soil, surface water, and ground water in and down gradient from the impact area. The data developed by the contractor demonstrated that no detectable concentrations of explosives or residues from explosives were found in the soil or water of the impact area.

The report, entitled *CLOSURE/POST CLOSURE PLAN FOR EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DETACHMENT OPEN DETONATION UNIT AT CAMP SHELBY TRAINING SITE, MISSISSIPPI*, Volume I, DRAFT, prepared by Ecology and Environment, Inc. of Pensacola, Florida, states (page 1-24): "These data indicate that no background concentrations of metals, VOC's, BNA's, pesticides, TCLP metals and BNA's, cyanide, or explosives exist above detection limits in the general vicinity of the Camp Shelby Training Site."

Please also see response to comments 2:33 and 14:35.

176:74 The proposed EOD sites are within the impact area buffer which is closed to public use for safety reasons. No public access to cut fuel wood will be allowed in this area. A site specific environmental analysis will be completed prior to construction. The question of disposal as firewood will be addressed at this time.

<p>c. Page 3-57 (3.) You state "...both sites will require construction site earth moving..." Please detail how soil will be kept on site.</p>	176:67
<p>d. Page 3-75. The alternative site is more attractive because of the smaller area of additional clearing required and less timber will be cut.</p>	176:68
<p>e. Page 3-83. Please address what measures will be followed to keep all disturbed soil on site and out of all surrounding vegetation.</p>	176:69
<p>f. Page 3.75. Please explain why the acreage value in the text does not agree with Table 3-11?</p>	176:70
<p>4. New Explosive Ordnance Disposal Facility. Section 1.3.4.</p>	
<p>b. Page 1-50. This facility is a hazardous waste miscellaneous unit. Please explain why the current impact area is not also a hazardous waste site since it contains some of the same exploded and unexploded ordnance.</p>	176:71
<p>c. Page 3-58 (4.) Off site siltation from construction is destructive to the area where the silt goes. Please detail the plans to keep silt on the construction site.</p>	176:72
<p>d. Page 3-64 (4.) Since this is a hazardous waste site and since the current impact area received the same ordnance over a longer period of time and is a probable hazardous waste site, what provisions are made for monitoring the ground water of the impact area.</p>	176:73
<p>e. Page 3-68 (4.) Please assure that no silt leaves the construction site. See Comment c. above.</p>	176:72
<p>f. Page 3-70 (4.) See comment c. above.</p>	
<p>g. Page 3-75 (4.) Fuel wood is a positive attribute of this site. Please show how you plan to use all woody vegetation in any other clearing for any facility or alternative.</p>	176:74

176:75 The site is in the impact area buffer, and, while no target areas are located in the buffer, it has similar limits on access, etc., and is frequently, as here, referred to as part of the impact area.

176:76 See additional coverage in Section 1.2.8.2.1 of the Final EIS. The number of aircraft do not vary by alternative, except for Alternative 6.

176:77 Portable toilets will be provided for all Tactical Aviation Areas which are in use. See Camp Shelby Regulation in Appendix C on field sanitation.

176:78 The discussions and data on Tactical Aviation Areas were presented in the Final EIS as filed, and may be incorporated by reference. As noted in the Record of Decision (Appendix B to this EIS), the *decision* was deferred to this EIS. In practice, most of the locations have been revised to avoid training areas, corridors, or environmentally sensitive locations.

176:79 The new locations proposed are applicable to all alternatives. See Section 1.3.5, Figure 1-26, of the Final EIS.

176:80 Comment noted. Please see Section 3.1.5.4 and response to comment 21:4.

176:81 As stated in Section 3.3.2.3 of the Final EIS, these areas are relatively small, and all are located in recently harvested openings.

176:82 Additional sites have been identified which are compatible with the revised training area proposals. Environmental analyses will be prepared prior to development. See also the response to comment 176:79.

h. Page 3-83 (4.) You state that this site is in the impact area. Figure 1-12 does not support this statement. Please explain why?

5. Tactical Aviation Training Area 1.3.5.

b. Page 1-54, section 1.3.5. You state that the number of aircraft would be as high as 45 for Battalion sized unit. Please specify a maximum number of aircraft for each alternative.

c. Page 1-54, section 1.3.5. Since there is to be 24 hour operation, Please detail the sanitary facilities to be used by the troops.

d. Page 1-54, section 1.3.5. You refer to this project as being part of the Training Facilities EIS 1991. You dropped this project and it is not part of that EIS, therefore you cannot incorporate the environmental evaluations. Please explain why this is done? Any reference to the Training Facility EIS 1991 is misleading since this project was dropped.

e. Page 1-54, section 1.3.5. You state the preferred alternatives are most relevant to alternative 4. What are the preferred sites for alternative 1, 2, 3A and 3B?

f. Page 1-54 section 1.3.5 I oppose any project site within the Leaf River WMA because of the impact of helicopter noise on game and nongame species. I also oppose any intrusion into the WMA because of the noise impact on local residents. Why is no noise impact evaluation included similar to the one for the impact area?

g. Page 1-54, section 1.3.5. What are the acres of net and gross use for this project? Why aren't they in Table 3-11?

h. Page 1-54 section 1.3.5. What other sites in addition to the 10 named are considered? If any additional sites are proposed will they be covered in a separate EA?

176:83 See response to comment 176:67.

176:84 See response to comments 176:67, 176:81 and 176:82.

176:85 Major portions of all the sites are in recently harvested openings. Approximately 100 mbf could be involved in the removal. This represents approximately one hour's harvest for Perry County alone, which mills about 300 mmbf annually. This is not considered significant nor relevant to the decision making process. Please also see response to comment 176:81.

176:86 See the response to comment 169:2.

176:87 Comment noted. The military preferred alternative did not always correspond to the environmentally preferred alternative. Please also see response to comment 176:82.

176:88 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 176:67.

176:89 Comment noted. This was a typographical error in the original text. The correct areas should have been T-29, T-35 and T-43. The areas in the figures are indeed located within these T areas, but regrettably did not show the boundaries or the area designations on the figure.

176:90 The reference in the Draft EIS to "use" was intended to mean no maneuver use would occur on wetlands under the (former) option involving such use. The present alternative does not include either maneuver use or wetland crossings.

i. Page 3-58 (6.). Earth moving is required in this project. Soil that leaves the construction site does irreparable damage to the area it settles in.. Detail procedures to keep soil on site.

j. Page 3-69 (6.) Are sites 3, 4, 9, and 10 the preferred sites?

k. Page 3-69 (6) Since leveling is required, assure that no silt leaves the site. See i. above.

l. Page 3-70 (6.) See i. above.

m. Page 3-76 (6.) See i. above. What are the acreages and timber volume-involved? Why aren't they included in Table 3-11 and 3-14?

n. Page 3-79 (TATA) You state "only minor effects on local timber supply..." What is the cumulative effect when added to all of the other clearing? This is significant information.

o. Page 3-84 (6.) Please discuss the impact of helicopter noise on game and non-game mammals and birds.

p. Page 1-55 and page 4-3 (TATA) The preferred alternatives are not the same. Why not?

6. CALFEX Assemble Area 1.3.6.

b. Page 3-58 (5.) Any soil disturbance that results in silt leaving the construction site does irreparable damage to the silted area. Please assure that no silt leaves the construction site in either option.

c. Page 3-68 (5.) You refer to T-29 and T-35 and cite Figure 3-27 and Table 3-11. T-29 and T-35 appears in neither of these. Please explain why not.

d. Page 3-68 (5.) You say you will exclude wetland areas from use, and yet you say you will cross them. That is a use. Are you being factual? Provide an explanation please.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Thomas Price

176:91 See response to comment 14:1.

Thomas L. Price
410 Weatherbury Road
Hattiesburg, MS 39402

11/22/91

Mrs. Tom Ciarra
Corps of Engineers
Mobile AL.

22 NOV 1991

Dear Tom,

Congratulations on getting your DEIS on the street. I know from experience it can be a thud on the road.

I respectfully request that the 60 day review period begin 1/1/92 and the public hearing be in February. I make this request based on the beginning of the Thanksgiving season and the Christmas-New Year season during the review period. For me this season is for family and church activities.

I have taken 2 years with many people waiting to prepare the DEIS. It seems reasonable to request adequate time to provide a quality review. Per 5 weeks represents only a fraction of the time to prepare and review the document.

May I have a reply as soon as possible

Sincerely
Thomas L. Price

176:91

177:1 See response to comment 62:1.

10 December 1991

James F. Puckett, M.D.
P.O. Box 16863
Hattiesburg, MS
39404-6863

Mr. Tom Craven
Department of the Army
Mobile District Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven,


I'm writing to request that the period for public comment on the DRAFT EIS for the "Military Training Use of National Forest Lands, Camp Shelby, Mississippi" be extended to permit a more thorough public evaluation of the document. I would also like to request that the public meetings scheduled for Jackson, Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast be delayed at least until late January or early February.

177:1

I justify this request on the basis of the documents release during the very busy holiday seasons of Thanksgiving and Christmas/New Year's making difficult any responsible evaluation of the results of your two years labor.

My feeling, from the Agency Briefing in Jackson 22 November, and from a cursory examination of the Draft EIS, is that your office has made an attempt to prepare a document that valued the public input obtained during the scoping process. I hope that in the case and that you will continue to do so.

Sincerely,


James F. Puckett, M.D.

JAMES F. PUCKETT

XXXXXXXXXXXX P.O. Box 16863
Hattiesburg, MS 39402 39404-6863

27 February 1992

Mr. Tom Craven
Mobile District, Corps of Engineers
CESAN-PD-EI
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven,

Following is are comments that I would like to be entered to the record of public comment regarding the DEIS for the proposed changes regarding additional and reconfigured DeSoto National Forest lands for the purpose of tank training:

1) Given the current uncertainty within the Department of Defense over the future U.S. military preparedness needs, including the combat role of Reserve and National Guard forces; and given my perception that the Department of Defense has not fulfilled, in good faith, its obligation to the Master Agreement between the DoD and the USFS by demonstrating that there are not existing DoD lands suitable for the additional tank training areas desired by the National Guard, I do not believe that any expansion and/or reconfiguration of tank training lands within the DeSoto National Forest can be justified. I reserve the right to change my opinion should these present circumstances change.

2) Regarding Appendix N, Vol.II of the DEIS- A STILLNESS IN THE PINES, the Ecology of the Red-Cockaded woodpecker, by Robert W. McFarlane, W.W. Norton & Company, 1992; identifies the entity of "starter trees" (Chapter 4), i.e., those pine trees in which RCW cavity holes have been initiated but not completed. I find no record that this entity was considered in the "Complete Survey of Camp Shelby, MS" (Appendix N), and I consider this to be a deficiency in the survey. I request that a statement be included in the Final EIS stating whether or not the entity of RCW "starter holes" were considered in the survey; and if so, specifically state that none were identified; and if not, that additional field work be conducted to verify whether or not any "starter holes" are present.

3) There is no analysis in the DEIS of wildfires- cause, acreage involved, frequency, seasonality, control and prevention measures and the cost in dollars to provide these services; the cost in dollars due to natural resources lost, and the mitigation measures applied for resource damage, including lost timber revenues. Please provide this information in the Final EIS.

4) The use of pesticides has received no treatment in the DEIS. Please provide in Final EIS, information regarding the types of pesticides used, the quantities used, their application and cost; please include an analysis of the measures available and used for the evaluation of the effects of these pesticides, both desired and undesired, and measures available and used for the monitoring of possible air, land and water contamination due to their use.

5) A list of jobs at Camp Shelby, both permanent and seasonal, civilian and military, by description and salary, would more clearly identify the economic impact of Camp Shelby to the local communities. Identification of those jobs considered "at risk" if the proposed additional and reconfigured changes in tank training lands are not granted should be identified. Please provide this information in the Final EIS.

Sincerely,

James F. Puckett

401

177:2 Comment noted. Please also see responses to comments 2:31 and 2:6 and misconceptions 5 and 8.

177:3 Starter holes and cavity trees are two of the indicators used in the RCW survey, and they were applied in the Camp Shelby survey.

177:4 See response to comment 176:4.

177:5 See response to comment 57:16.

177:6 Camp Shelby employs permanent and seasonal employees. In FY 92 there was 703 permanent employees and 224 seasonal employees at the Training Site. Personnel work in several different functional areas such as Logistics, Maintenance, Administration, Engineering, and Trainers. Employers are the Camp Shelby Training Site (CSTS), Mobilization and Training Equipment Site (MATES), Combined Support Maintenance Shop 9CSCMSO, Equipment Concentration Site (ECS), Regional Support School Detachment (RSSD), Mississippi Post Exchange (PX), Explosive Ordnance Detachment (EOD), Credit Union, and the Maintenance Instruction Team (MAIT), Air National Guard and a dining Facility Contractor.

Employees at Camp Shelby are a mixture of Federal Technicians, State Employees, Active Guard and Reserve (AGR), Active Army and other such as the Credit Union and PX (AAFES). Employees are further classified as Warehouse, Production Controllers, Equipment Operators, Personnel Managers, Secretaries, Trainers, Accountants, Security Guards, Firemen, Engineers, Environmentalists, Range Control Workers, Cooks, Custodians and Laborers.

Job descriptions for all employees at Camp Shelby are on file with the personnel officer. Section 3.2.4.1 states that under Alternative 6 all military training and other functions at Camp Shelby would be stopped. Therefore, all jobs at Camp Shelby would be "at risk" should Alternatives 6 be adopted. The same section also states "other alternatives or combinations thereof are believed to involve retention of the existing workforce." Although Alternatives #2, 3A, 3B, 4 and 5 do not directly place jobs at risk, these alternatives do not meet the Army Standard for training the Armored Brigade. The response to commentor 176:13 provides the dollar impact for each Alternative.

See also the response to comments 176:13 and 176:23.

177:5

177:4

177:6

178:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 28:1. See general misconception statement 12.

CHARLEY RALEY ROOFING CO.

POST OFFICE BOX 288
GAUTIER, MISSISSIPPI 39553
PHONE (601) 497-3816

2-16-92

MR. CRAVEN

I HUNT IN THE DESOTO NATIONAL FOREST
& HAVE STRONG OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED
LAND STEAL. THIS BEAUTIFUL LAND CANNOT
BE A TANK TRAINING GROUND AND A
WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA. THE TWO JUST
DON'T MIX.

178:1

I FEEL THE PRESSURE OF THE GOVERNMENT
TAKING MORE & MORE OF MY EARNINGS UNTIL
I'M UNABLE TO DRAW A BREATH WITHOUT PART OF IT
BEING TAKEN.

IT'S TIME FOR YOU TO LISTEN TO THE
TAXPAYER.

Charles F. Raley, Sr.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Franklin Rawlings



**GULF COAST
EYE CLINIC**

March 12, 1992

Mobile District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers CESAM-PD-EI
Attn: Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

I would like to oppose the use of the Desoto National Forest by the Department of Defense for tank maneuvers. I would take exception with the recently released environmental impact statement from the Army Corps of Engineers on this project. I specifically oppose use of any of the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area for tank maneuvers. Under the National Guard's Alternative #1, nearly 80% of the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area will be used for tank training - this is Mississippi's oldest and most popular game management area. This area is used for hunting, fishing, and wildlife observing as well as camping by many of the sportsmen in the coastal area. In fact, this game management area is totally accessible by vehicle, much unlike the Pascagoula River Wildlife Management Area. Another problem with the acquisition of this land for tank maneuvers is the clear-cutting of more than 77 million board feet of public lands. Our National Forests are best served by selective cutting as needed to manage the timber and wildlife resources and not clear-cutting of nearly 14,000 acres as is proposed by the National Guard. Clear-cutting of land as proposed in alternative #1 will result in erosion and degradation of Black Creek which is Mississippi's only designated wild and scenic stream. I would like to propose if any expansion of the tank maneuvers is contemplated that this be limited to the area northwest of the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area-specifically Alternative 3B.

I hope you are aware of the General Accounting Office's investigation of combat readiness after the recent Gulf War. Their conclusions places serious doubts on the need and proficiency of the training units that used Camp Shelby.

179:1 Comment noted. Additional coverage has been included on the history and potential for effects on the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area (Sections 2.4.6, 3.1.6, 3.3.6, and 3.5.12). Please also see response to comments 14:28 and 30:2 and misconception 14.

179:2 Your comment is noted. The method of cutting on National Forest Administered lands is prescribed by a professional forester after considering each stand's silvicultural needs. The method of cut varies from stand to stand and ranges in intensity from no cutting through selective cutting to clear cutting. No single method of timber harvest is considered best by professional foresters for all species or stand conditions. Please also see general misconception statement 12.

179:3 See response to comments 10:5, 14:46, and 35:6.

179:4 Comment noted. Please see misconceptions 5, 7, and 19.

179:5 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6 and misconceptions 3 and 8.

179:1

179:2

179:3

179:4

179:5

179:6 Comment noted. Please see added material on the role of the national Guard in Section 1.1.2.3 of the Final EIS and see response to comments 179:1, 2:6 and 21:3

179:7 Comment noted.

The Army ultimately did not deploy any of the three brigades that used the Camp Shelby area to the Persian Gulf. The Army has been directed to restudy the roles of its reserve units and, in fact, in the future, these units may be eliminated. It would be a real shame if the Wildlife Management Area was used initially for tank maneuvers with great destruction to the environment and then the whole Camp Shelby area ultimately closed for the best interest of defense planning. In this scenario, everyone would lose.

For the last many years it seems that Mississippi has been the brunt of destruction of much of its prize public land by the Corps of Engineers and other Federal agencies. Unfortunately our population is not as well educated or informed as those in other states and we perhaps are a good target for various non-desired Corps of Engineers projects. The wildlife and resources that need defense in this case are unable to defend themselves and therefore need our wise management to enable their survival.

Sincerely,


E. Franklin Rawlings, D.D., FACS

EFR/bh

cc: Senator Trent Lott
Congressman Gene Taylor
Colonel Pete Denton

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Laurie Recore

180:1 Comment noted. The figure of 116,000 acres is the total area of the present Special Use Permit, and does not correspond to the area proposed for maneuver use. Please also see responses to comment 2:6. See general misconception statement 5.

180:2 Comment noted.

180:1

Dear Mr. Cramer,
I have remained silent until now. I don't belong to any groups for or against the land expansion. I have tried to remain open to all ideas, but I'm afraid now that I have come to a sound decision that the land should be left alone. I plainly can see military spending reducing to almost a stand still.

Let's not sacrifice 116,000 acres of rich land until we have an abundance of military money so that the sacrifice is worth it for everyone. This land is desperately needed & wonderfully used already. Leaving the land alone as we only might think to do, anything else would be gravely wrong for everyone especially the National Guard. I say again, leave the land alone!

Sincerely
Laurie Recore

180:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Elizabeth Reese

- 181:1** Comment noted. Please also see responses to comments 2:6 and 35:12 and misconceptions 8 and 9.
- 181:2** See response to comments 2:6 and 16:7.
- 181:3** See response to comment 35:6.
- 181:4** The direct beneficiaries of timber sales are both the federal and county governments. All timber receipts go directly to the federal treasury. Twenty-five percent of these receipts are then disbursed back proportionally to the counties containing National Forest administered lands for use on roads and schools. There are many indirect beneficiaries of timber sales including woods workers, mill workers, Forest Service and other associated employment, various species of wildlife, etc.
- 181:5** Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 35:27. See general misconception statement 7.

ELIZABETH S. REESE
406 LEFT DAVIS AVENUE
RAVELAND, MS 39576

March 20, 1992

Mobile District U.S. Army Corps
of Engineers CESAM-PD-EI
Attention Thomas M. Craven
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001

Re: Camp Shelby Land Expansion

Dear Mr. Craven:

I understand that as a result of the Environmental Impact Statement on the Camp Shelby Land Expansion the Mississippi National Guard is proposing a plan (alternative #1) which they have stated will have no significant impact on the De Soto National Forest and the Leaf River Management Area.

First, I find it hard to believe that in the light of the fact that there are proposed cuts to the military before Congress and the Army is handing out pink slips to 2000 of their senior officers, we are considering enlarging the area dedicated to tank training. Also at issue is the fact that lack of training space was definitely not found to be a problem in an investigation of combat readiness conducted by the General Accounting Office after the Gulf War.

Secondly, as a frequent canoeer on Black Creek, I definitely do not want to see erosion and run off caused by clear-cutting ruining our only congressionally designated Wild and Scenic stream. I would also like to know who profits from the sale of the timber from public lands.

While I would prefer that no additional land be slated for clear-cutting (Remember the Ozone Layer!), alternative 3B represents a compromise which will allow the National Guard adequate training space, but will keep tanks out of the LRWMA. Alternative #1 would allow the Guard to seriously harm prime natural areas as a result of tank training, while abandoning lands already used for that purpose. The difference in the two alternatives is only 2,220 acres!

Because of the rapidly changing political situation, both national and international, it can only make sense to make any changes slowly and with due deliberation. It would be terrible to proceed with alternative #1, whacking down a beautiful forest and destroying wildlife habitats, only to have Camp Shelby closed anyway!

181:1

181:2

181:3

181:4

181:5

181:1

181:6 Comment noted.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Re: Camp Shelby
March 20, 1992
Page 2

I almost didn't write this, because I feel there is a hidden agenda concerning Camp Shelby, and that it probably wouldn't change anything. But I feel very strongly about this and I had to try. A response would be appreciated.

181:6

Yours very truly,



Elizabeth S. Reese
member-Sierra Club
Audubon Society
National Conservancy

cc: Colonel Pete Denton
Citizens Against the Land Steal
P. O. Box 219
Brooklyn, MS 39425

BILL & PEGGY RHODES
204 E. Cherry Street
P. O. Box 178
Ackerman, MS 39735

Dear Mr. Thomas M. Craven -

Please do all you can to oppose the allowing Campbell to expand into any additional areas of the Desoto National Forest, which would include the Leaf River Wildlife Management area.

We are not at war, and even during Desert Storm, we knew that the sound shot brigades were not used due to lack of training space, but because of medical deficiencies.

The forests of Mississippi are being raped everyday in our area by the large paper companies, and for the new tank munition areas to require decimating 21,312 acres of our National Forest Land that is supposed to be protected is a

unthinkable. Please do not do this to our National Forest & Leaf River Area. It may be ecologically later than we realize.

Thank you sincerely,
Peggy Rhodes

182:1

182:2

182:3

182:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 5.

182:2 See response to comments 2:6 and 16:7.

182:3 Comment noted. Please see the response to comments 28:3 30:2 for a discussion of the uses of National Forest lands, and misconception 22.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Troy Rich

- 183:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:8. See general misconception statement 5.
- 183:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 2:20, 2:244 and 2:339.
- 183:3 Comment noted. See response to comment 21:3.
- 183:4 Comment noted. Please see misconception statements 9, 10, and 11.
- 183:5 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:3.
- 183:6 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:6.
- 183:7 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:5.
- 183:8 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 2

Mr. Gaven;

This letter is to inform all concerned that I am opposed to the Army's expansion of Camp Shelby. As I am a native Mississippian and a resident of south MS, my voice should count.

I say NO:

- to the loss of recreational areas
- to the flooded woods
- to the pollution to the land and water of the area.
- to the disturbing of the natural beauty of the land.

(E) to disturbing the animals (ALL)

(F) to destruction of family, landowner, business (to loss of jobs and income the people of Mississippi by changing them and the land.

I could say more to apperance I should be more to apperance.

Your understanding of my apperance to the expansion into the Delta. I think Forest Land would be greatly expanded. The cost to destroy this land would be millions of taxpayer dollars spent for the U.S. Army. The cost would

183:8

See \$0.00 dollar to stop
This proposal means Day No!
Protect our Land.
Protect our future.
Protect our rights - My rights

Sincerely,
Dorothy R. Dr
13611 Silver River Rd.
Shillington, Pa. 391503
601 832 5825

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Bryan Richard

184:1 Comment noted. See response to comments 2:31 and 28:1. See general misconception statement 12.

184:2 Comment noted. The history of the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area and a discussion of the likely changes in that area as a result of the proposed action is presented in Sections 2.4.6, 3.1.6, 3.3.6, and 3.5.12 of the Final EIS. Please also see general misconception statement numbers 12, 14, and 23.

184:3 Comment noted. See response to comment 2:6. See general misconception statement 12.

184:1

184:2

184:3

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

I THINK THE LANDSWAP IS A RIP
OFF, WHY CAN'T THEY GO SOMEWHERE
ELSE. IF THEY TAKE LRWMA WHERE DO
US STILL HUNTERS GO. THERE IS ONLY
ONE OTHER STILL HUNTING ONLY
MANAGEMENT AREA LEFT, IF THEY
TAKE OVER. IT IS VERY SMALL, THERE
ISN'T HARDLY ENOUGH SPACE FOR
PEOPLE TO HUNT ON NOW WITH
LRWMA. LRWMA IS THE OLDEST
WMA IN THE STATE, IT WOULD
BE A SIN TO DESTROY IT SINCE
IT PLAYED A VITAL ROLE IN BRING-
ING BACK THE WHITETAIL DEER
POPULATION NOT TO MENTION THE
TURKEY POPULATION TO THE AM
FERIES ARE STEADY CUTTING BACK WHY
DO THEY NEED THIS. DID ANYONE STOP
TO THINK THAT WHAT IF THE ARMY TAKES
OVER & CLEAR CUTS IT ALL, WHEN THEY
CLOSED AFTER ALL THEY DON'T DO
IT, BECAUSE THE ARMY DON'T CARE
ALL THEY THINK ABOUT IS THERE OVER?

I SINCERELY HOPE YALL OR
WHOEVER GIVE THIS ALLOT OF THOUGHT
ARE THEY GOING TO TAKE THIS
LAND FROM PEOPLE WHO NEED
IT + USE IT OR GIVE TO A
BUNCH OF GREEDY MILITARY
ASSHOLES WHO ARE NEVER
SATISFIED.

LOVE TO HUNT
IN LRA MIA

BRYAN RICHARD

184:4

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Susan and Bill Richter

185:1 Comment noted. See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31. Please also see general misconception statement number 12.

185:2 Comment noted. The National Training Center does provide superior training in maneuver of armor and mechanized units. Access is limited, however, to those units, largely Regular Army units, which have conducted rigorous unit level training at their home location in advance of travel to the NTC. It is the lack of capability to conduct training at a level which would qualify units for access to the NTC which is the basis of the proposed action. Please also see response to comment 2:31.

185:3 Comment noted. See response to comments 3:12 and 17:5 and general misconception statements 9, 11 and 25.

185:4 Comment noted. Tank gunnery is an issue, as is tracked vehicle maneuver. There is no proposal, however, that the maneuvering vehicles fire weapons. Please also see response to comment 102:5 and general misconception statement 13.

March 1, 1992

Mr. Tom Craven
Department of the Army
Mobile District Corps of Engineers
Inland Environment Section
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

As a lifelong citizen of the state of Mississippi, I would like to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Military Training Use of National Forest Lands at Camp Shelby, Mississippi.

One of the major problems that I have with the possible reconfiguration of lands surrounding Camp Shelby for battalion level tank maneuvering is that there is no definitive word from any federal agency that the acquisition of lands for a training area of this kind is necessary at this time. It would be helpful for this to be addressed in the final draft of the EIS. The General Accounting Office Report B-244872 (September 24, 1991), indicates that the Army's National Training Center, "provides the most realistic environment available for unit training during peacetime and the most comprehensive, objective evaluation of unit proficiency" for training of the type considered for Camp Shelby. If a training center is already available for such training, then why duplicate the effort at the expense of Mississippi public lands? With all of the efforts by the federal government to reduce military spending, it stands to reason that duplication of services is unnecessary.

I am most concerned that the alternative preferred by the National Guard, (Alternative 1), includes virtually all of the Leaf River Game Management Area, (and, that the Guard has portrayed this alternative as being the guarantor of a future Camp Shelby). This Management Area is a very popular hunting area. It also serves as a special birdwatching area and is enjoyed by hikers and backpackers. Clear-cutting for tank maneuvering, and the maneuvering itself, would permanently alter this area. The habitat would be so drastically altered that animals would move out of the area, and hunters, bird-watchers, and hikers would no longer be able to enjoy the area in its present pristine state. I would also venture to speculate that most citizens who currently enjoy the recreational opportunities of the area would not be interested in engaging in their respective pastimes during tank firing maneuvers, (even though I was assured by a representative of the National Guard that the area would not

185:1

185:2

185:3

185:4

185:5 Comment noted. Please refer to response to comments 16:6 and 184:2.

185:6 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6.

Page 2

be closed to public access during training maneuvers, and that I could enjoy the area in spite of the firing of the tanks). I do not believe that enough information was gathered concerning recreational usage of this area, and would like to see this better addressed in the final draft.

185:4

Further, if the Leaf River Game Management Area is included in the reconfiguration, the implementation of ITAM as the instrument of mitigation will be a wasted effort. There is no way to mitigate the loss of a resource such as this. It does not make good economic or political sense to gamble with one of the oldest Game Management Areas in the state, in view of current questions concerning military spending.

185:5

185:6

Thank you for making this document available for public comment.

Sincerely,

Susan Richter
Bill Richter
Susan Richter
Bill Richter
4839 Sheridan Drive
Jackson, MS 39206
(601) 981-5019

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
William and Camellia Ricks

William K. & Camellia B. Ricks
6512 Shore Drive
Ocean Springs, Ms 39564
February 24, 1992

Mr. Thomas M. Craven
Corps. of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001

Re: Proposed National Guard training in Leaf River Wildlife
Management Area

Dear Mr. Craven:

The Desoto National Forest and Leaf River Wildlife Management Area belong to us! As hard working tax paying citizens of the United States and residents of the State of Mississippi, and economic contributors to our democratic society we sincerely trust our voices will be heard! We pray that the U.S. Forest Service is strong ethically and will not find itself championing the survival of the most fit (U.S. Army) in it's proposed tank training in our beloved Leaf River Wildlife Management Area. The U.S. Forest Service ethics will surely include fairness and justice.

It is not fair that the forests in the State of Mississippi and especially those forests in South Mississippi have already been raped of their natural abundance of hardwoods that exemplify the well being of the natural wildlife and the unparalleled beauty these trees bring to a forest. This has already happened and by itself is bad enough but to know that now the Forest Service is considering destroying our oldest wildlife management area in Mississippi is more that I can consciously accept.

There are so many reasons this plan is not sound and is unacceptable to the residents of our state. I feel that each and every logical reason opposing this Army land acquisition has been presented before you numerous times. Mississippi has the right to defend and protect its' special resources. We've traveled extensively throughout the forests of our neighboring states and in the Southeastern region of the U.S. and have experienced, with great pride, those feelings of knowing we have the best managed wildlife and forest programs (with exception of taking out the hardwoods) anywhere. We can't begin to tell you, too, how extensively we've lauded the Forest Service for its' capable management programs and all the very fine work it's done within our state. These forests are something to be very proud of. We have been amazed that even with constant diminishing of necessary funds

186:1 Comment noted. Please also see responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31 and misconceptions 9 and 16.

186:2 Comment noted.

186:3 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 97:9 and 166:2.

186:4 Comment noted. See response to comment 21:3.

186:5 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 3:12, 16:2, 17:5, and 18:1 and misconceptions 9 and 14.

186:6 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 5 and 12.

186:7 Comment noted.

186:1

186:1

186:5

186:6

the state's forest continue to be such a source of pride -- for these forests are second to none. This Army land acquisition would be like selling our golden goose for a mess of pottage! This is not fair to the residents who need this forest to be there. The American dream means more than a home, a new car, and college education for our kids. Middle income people that have given years of hard work, loyalty and productivity to our nation and state are deserving of modest rewards concerning our quality of life. This forest is our natural resource -- our place to recreate our minds and bodies so that we may continue to be productive citizens -- it gives back to us funds for our schools and roads and protects the fragile ecosystems of our wildlife. These things breathe the life back into the American dream. It seems this American dream is in a deep sleep here in Mississippi and we can not allow the further erosion of our God-given natural resource. There is no fairness or justice in allowing the rape of these resources by the Army's proposed use of this land when an alternative could be conscientiously considered to keep these tanks out of the Leaf River Management Area.

If America keeps functioning in its' current political and legal climate it won't be long before a drastic change in the government be required to save ourselves from the realities of global competition, deregulated businesses, individual greed, increasingly expensive health care benefits plus economic recession and now the threat of the permanent loss of our state's most valuable possession, these forests and their environmental impact on all our lives.

As you read this letter, consider where you fit into the life picture of our planet -- Earth. The ultimate end to this kind of trade off will be doom for us all. We are truly bringing Mother Nature to her knees. What will it take to wake us up? What can you do?

Please help us in preventing Mississippi from becoming the nation's landfill for the unsuitable situations that are unacceptable in the other states. Please do not destroy her and us.

Respectfully,

William K. Ricks

William K. Ricks

- and -

Camellia B. Ricks

Owners

The French Connection Restaurant
Biloxi, Mississippi

186:6


186:2

186:3

186:4

186:1

186:7



PREFERRED MAINTENANCE PRODUCTS, INC.

MAIL
P.O. Box 16507
Jackson, MS 39236

LOCATION
1668 Cedars of Lebanon
Jackson, MS 39236

February 19, 1992

Mr. Thomas Craven
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Sir:


Has the Army or Corps of Engineers considered a tank training center somewhere in the Southwest on Government property? (where hardly anyone lives)

Why all this trying to cram it down "Mississippi Peoples" throats?

We must not destroy our national forests, not even one acre! There is nothing pretty about 20,000 acres of strip-cut land. Could it be that there is going to be plenty of profit made in this maneuver?

Please talk to the people in the area and LISTEN to them, as well as other Mississippi Citizens...

Sincerely,


A.A. Robinson
P.O. Box 16507
Jackson, MS 39236

cc: Congressman G.V. "Sonny" Montgomery

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mr. A.A. Robinson

187:1 See response to comment 2:31 and misconception 16.

187:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 3:12 and 17:5, and misconception 9. See additional coverage on mitigation of adverse impacts found in Section 3.4. The only financial transactions involved with this project are the sale of timber and the issuing of contracts for construction, maintenance, and mitigation. See response to comments 97:9, 166:2, and 181:4.

187:1

187:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Ms. Sarah L. Rowe

111N 33rd Ave. Apt. E-11
Hattiesburg, MS 39401

Dear Thomas Craven,

As a concerned citizen, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the DeSoto National Forest 'Land Steal'. Having familiarized myself with the draft Environmental Impact Statement, it is evident that the Army Corps of Engineers were insincere in their motives for this study, and only superficially carried it out. The draft EIS shows a flagrant disregard for the environment. It is clear that it is founded not upon sound evidence, but has been shaped by short term political and economic goals. The long term ramifications of the 'Land Steal' have sadly been ignored.

Contrary to what the National Guard would have us believe, it is obvious that alternative #1 would have a catastrophic impact upon the natural and cultural resources of the DeSoto National Forest. Alternative #1 would lead to the destruction of 39,772 acres, of which 36,349 acres have not previously been used for tank maneuvers. Furthermore, if the National Guard's irresponsible plan is instituted it will require an infrastructure of access roads and supply and maintenance depots to support the tank maneuvers, which will accentuate the pollution and ultimate destruction of the local environment. In addition to this ecological disaster, the human repercussions of the 'Land Steal' must not be ignored. The clear-cutting of 14,105 acres and thinning of 7,112 acres of public forest will result in the loss of over 77 million board feet of timber, which will cause a loss of timber revenues and forestry related jobs. Also the effluent sewed out by the tanks, as well as noise pollution, will not only have a detrimental effect upon people living in the area, but also those throughout the state, who come Black Creek (which is Mississippi's only congressionally designated Wild and Scenic stream), and the DeSoto National Forest for recreational purposes.

In support of their plan, the National Guard state that the expansion is necessary to protect Camp Shelby from closure. However, such a claim is unsubstantiated, and given the Government's proposed military cuts it is criminal to sacrifice 39,772 acres of forest in the vague hope that it might be a factor in preventing a possible closure. If the National Guard wish to improve Camp Shelby they should more effectively utilize existing land, not squander more. To add credence to this point, a study by the General Accounting Office of three brigades activated at Camp Shelby for the Gulf War, showed that problems derived from, "severe weakness" in NCO leadership, poor discipline and a lack of "proficiency in basic soldiering skills." (GAO/NSIAD-91-263 p17) Surely non of these problems

188:1 Comment noted. The acreage values quoted represent the study area, and not the area proposed to be modified in any alternative. Economic benefit has never been claimed by the proponent. Please also see response to comment 10:1 and misconceptions 5, 12, and 25.

188:2 The fixed infrastructure is already in place at Camp Shelby, as are responsible pollution prevention programs. See Appendix C for the contents of the current Camp Shelby Environmental Regulations. The Environmental Awareness Program at Camp Shelby is designed to inform soldiers of the environmental consequences of petroleum product spills. Prior to any training activity at Camp Shelby, units are briefed on the policies and procedures for spill prevention and further required by regulation to maintain and operate their equipment in a state of repair that prevents spills and leaks. Camp Shelby has in place a spill prevention, control, and counter-measures plan and an installation spill contingency plan in accordance with AR 200-1 and 40 CFR 112. These plans address actions required to prevent accidental release of petroleum products into the environment and address containment, counter-measures, and reporting procedures in the event of their accidental release. The Directorate of Facilities Engineering maintains the necessary equipment and personnel for spill containment and clean-up. Used oil generated at CSTS is picked up by a contractor for recycling.

188:3 See response to comments 21:2 and 21:5 and misconception 12..

188:4 See response to comments 21:4, 21:8 and 35:6 and misconception 15.

188:5 See responses to comments 2:6 and 16:7.

188:5

would be improved by acquiring yet more land.

For the reasons cited above, I firmly believe that the 'Land Steal' must be prevented at all cost. Although the Sierra Club and Citizens Against the Land Steal support alternative 3B, I feel that no compromise should be or can be made. This is an issue of the gravest significance, the National Guard must not be allowed to 'ride rough-shod' over the people of Mississippi. I urge you to support us in our opposition to the 'Land Steal'.

188:6

Sincerely yours,

Sarah L. Rowe

Sarah L. Rowe

Mr. Thomas Craven,
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Mobile District
Mobile, AL

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Susan Scott

1904 Evergreen Lane
Hattiesburg, MS 39401

Dear Mr Craven:

I read with interest the very brief Historic Preservation Plan section of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Camp Shelby tank maneuver areas, and find it to be less than satisfactory. My comments are outlined below.

A) In my opinion, COE archaeologists have created a house of cards based on an Historic Preservation Plan that 1) was never approved by the U.S. Forest Service, and 2) has not been acknowledged as sufficient by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The plan is vague regarding how "sampling" is to be conducted, a shortcoming that should have been corrected since clarification was requested by Mark DeLeon (as a representative of the U.S. Forest Service for the area in question). The plan is ambiguously worded and can be interpreted as implying that 10% of "moderately disturbed areas" and 20% of "low disturbance areas" will be surveyed as a percentage of acreage. COE archaeologists have interpreted this statement to mean that surveys need be conducted only at a percentage of locales. This indefensible interpretation is further compounded by restricting the already ridiculously small survey acreage to an absolutely unbelievably low figure by proposing that sites will be located only on high ground adjacent to water, following DeLeon's probabilistic statement that this is true only for a majority of sites. In effect, the sample universe took three major cuts: one due to excessive land disturbance, one due to what appears, upon implementation, to be an intentionally misleading historic preservation plan, and finally by wholeheartedly embracing a tentatively offered probabilistic model that has not yet been subjected to sufficient testing to confirm or refute its' merit. I am willing to concede that the first cut was warranted: the other two, quite frankly, have the appearance of smoke and mirrors produced by your staff to subvert the very process they are employed to ensure. I hope this appearance is accidental.

B) In January of 1990, I sent a letter to you recommending that the methodology employed in archaeological survey "include systematic, close interval shovel testing" and that the excavated soil be screened. This recommendation was based on good results obtained by Scott and Associates in a series of archaeological surveys in adjacent counties. According to the text of the DEIS, a "test" was performed using the recommended field techniques, with little (or even negative) return [pp. 2-45, 2-46]. Since this result runs counter to my experience, I obtained a copy of the report outlining the COE methodology (Memorandum for the Record, April 12, 1990). I have summarized the results of this

189:1 Comment noted. The purpose of a Historic Preservation Plan is to provide the facility with a document which may be understood and followed. Its primary purpose is to act as a guide for future actions in the preservation of resources.

189:2 Comment noted. Please refer to comment 10:8.

189:3 Comment noted. Please refer to comments 10:8 and 10:9.

189:7 Comment noted. The approach used in locating archeological sites at Camp Shelby was largely dependent on the environmental conditions at each High Potential (HP) area. To offset any built-in bias, Forest Service and the SHPO archeologists (Mr. S. Brooks and Mr. S. McCahey, respectively), selected six of the ten HPs to be surveyed incorporating shovel test and auger testing techniques. Both the Forest Service and the Mississippi SHPO's offices agreed with the survey techniques. All excavated soils were put through 1/4-inch hardware cloth.

The magnitude of ground disturbance at Camp Shelby cannot be over emphasized. Soils are eroded and most often archeological survey is conducted on exposed subsoil. Neither shovel nor auger testing is usually appropriate under these conditions. Area 31 soils consisted of 1 inch of recent litter and humus over a subsoil. Shovel tests revealed three flakes and one projectile point at a site discovered through surface observation.

The point to be made here is that shovel tests did not *discover* the site. Sites in this area were exposed by roads and firebreaks.

The survey of Area 32 was similar. The archeological site within this area was exposed on the surface. No additional cultural material was located through shovel testing.

Also see responses to comments 189:1, 189:6, 189:4, and 189:5.

189:1

189:2

189:3

189:7

reputed "test" in the attached table, which I think clearly demonstrates that 1) the "test" was anything but, and 2) when the recommended methodology was used (albeit briefly), numerous archaeological sites were found.

189:7

Assuming that shovel testing or augering was not performed unless stated in the memo and that all sediment was screened, the following results are reported:

a) At the only two locales actually subjected to shovel testing (#s 31 and 32), three sites were discovered. At area 31 where only 15 shovel tests were excavated, two sites were found. The number of shovel tests excavated in Area 32 is not specified, but the shovel interval (150") far exceeds the recommended interval (<100") specified in the Mississippi Department of Archives and History Guide to Cultural Resource Surveys (Guideline # 4, attached). It is a particularly low figure if this transect was run through a high probability area rather than through all terrain. Furthermore, shovel tests were excavated along a single transect, contrary to my original recommendation. Considering what appears to have been a less than energetic attempt to find sites, three is not a bad return for an area purported to be largely devoid of sites.

b) Interestingly, and without explanation, shovel testing was discontinued at this point and further areas involved in this "test" were surface collected only (areas 36, 37, 38, and 39), or tested with a 4" bucket auger (areas 33, 34, 35, and 40). The change in technique at this point is unexplained. In my experience, augers (of any kind) are traditionally employed by archaeologists primarily in alluvial valleys where sites might be deeply buried, making a sufficiently deep "shovel test" impossible. Since topsoils in these "high probability areas" vary from 0 to 7" deep, and rarely exceed 3", augering is a breathtakingly inefficient approach to finding sites. In effect, substituting a 4" auger in lieu of a 12" by 12" shovel test reduced the subsurface sample to 1/9 of the "customary" size. Therefore the statement that 34 auger tests failed to produce even one site (in area 34) is not surprising since, in areal extent, the stated sample is equivalent to fewer than four shovel tests, and volumetrically, with soils ranging from 1 to 3" deep, less than one cubic foot of topsoil was screened. Despite this change in approach, several more sites were discovered in the surveyed areas. One site was found in the surface collected areas (#37), a success rate of 25%, while augering produced a 50% return (2 of 4 areas with no sites, one with one site, one with two sites).

189:9

In sum, where subsurface testing was employed, even though it appears to have been very limited in extent, sites were found in 67% (4 of 6) of the attempts. In contrast, attempting to locate sites through surface examination of previously logged areas, the model upon which DeLeon based his analysis of site location for the area, succeeded only 25% of the time. In my opinion, considering the fact that the archaeology of this area

189:4

189:4 Comment noted. Shovel test, auger test or surface inspection was dictated by the survey environment. Five sites were located by surface inspections, one site was found with auger tests, and none were found through shovel tests. Given that lands within Camp Shelby are largely eroded, excavation of subsoils whether with shovel or auger, would be unrewarding--no matter how hard one worked. Further the archeology of the area is not unknown. Surveys by the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, and others, have documented that the majority of sites within Camp Shelby are upland lithic scatters.

189:8 Comment noted. The archeological sites found in Area 31 and 32 were not discovered through shovel testing. Rather they were visible on the surface, exposed by roads or firebreaks.

The Mississippi Survey Guidelines are just that--guidelines. It is the responsibility of every archaeologist to determine the appropriateness and application of any guideline based on the situation and survey environment. The application of the SHPO's guidelines was to ensure that they were applied to find sites and not blindly followed to meet a requirement. More than one transect was not needed to adequately survey for significant sites within these areas.

Proponents have not contended that the Camp Shelby archeological universe is devoid of sites. There is a marked absence, however, of significant archeological sites. The sites located at Camp Shelby by the Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Forest Service and others are typically located on ridge tops, there is an absence of top soil, the sites are shallow with no midden, and are usually lithic scatters resting on subsoil. The original soils of Camp Shelby have long since eroded.

Please also see response to comment 189:7.

189:9 Comment noted. Auger testing for the absence or presence of archeological sites is an acceptable professional tool. Further, auger testing will certainly locate sites having sufficient material and depth to make them eligible for the National Register. If augers are used for finding 1 and 2 flake and shallow unconsolidated sites (sites normally ineligible for the National Register), they don't work well. But neither does shovel testing. Augers will find eligible archeological sites.

None of the sites located within areas 31-40 was found with shovel tests and one site in Area 35 was found with auger tests. The sites within these areas, except Area 35, were visible on the surface, exposed either by road cuts or firebreaks.

The reason for selecting to use a bucket auger as opposed to a shovel was a professional judgement based on the desire to select the subsurface testing method that would give the greatest horizontal (i.e., areal) coverage in the least amount of time. Since sites are shallow or on the surface, depth of test (volume of soil removed) seems immaterial. The key to finding sites is horizontal coverage because more area can be covered with an auger than with a shovel.

is largely unknown, these results warrant a more intensive testing regime, minimally in these high probability areas, and preferably by professional archaeologists willing to work hard.

I would also like to express some dismay at the very limited amount of time actually devoted to this assessment by the archaeologists in your district. According to my calculations, a maximum of 72 hours of fieldwork was performed (memo), covering an average of 12 acres per hour in high probability areas (figures taken from DEIS). Since the Mississippi Department of Archives and History considers coverage of >50 acres/day (in any terrain) to border on the unbelievable, such extensive coverage is unusual, particularly when sustained over several days. Perhaps some discussion of the areal extent of the surveys performed by COE archaeologists for this report would help to clear up this seeming anomaly. Maps of the surveyed areas also are appropriate but are not provided.

Finally, I would like to add that there seems to be an inordinate amount of bias in these discussions about finding what are termed "significant" sites, i.e., sites that meet criteria necessary to be included on the National Register of Historic Places. Sites need not meet these criteria to be "significant" from the standpoint of regional archaeology. Only by systematically documenting sites for regions can we make probabilistic statements about prehistoric land-use patterns, and changes in them through time. Without systematic coverage, negative evidence for sites (in itself an important piece of information) can never be assumed. As a consequence of this lacuna, the regional politics of the area prehistorically will not be well documented. I cannot stress strongly enough that even the small, deflated hunting camps likely to be abundant in the proposed tank training area (and likely to be irreparably destroyed) are significant collectively. Every effort should be made to collect these data before they are gone.

Sincerely,

Mary L. Scott

Susan L. Scott
Scott and Associates

Comment regarding Area 40:

Since figures for the number of auger tests are not provided for Area 40, the probable number of tests was extrapolated using figures provided for Area 34 (34 tests per two person-day in the field = 2.125 bucket auger tests per person hour). Time spent on-site was estimated based on the assumption that A) an equal amount of time was spent at each area visited on the day in question and that B) the memo, written on the same date, was done after spending a full 8 hours per person in the field. Based on these assumptions, a total of 7 bucket auger tests were performed in Area 40, the equivalent of less than one shovel test. If they found one site with this degree of exertion, I suspect shovel testing would yield many more.

189:10

189:5 Comment noted. In most cases, the area surveyed had been logged at least once or otherwise severely used in some fashion. Surface visibility was generally good to excellent because of presence of roads and trails and other surface disturbance. Subsurface materials could be observed in places where erosion had removed upper strata. All reports submitted to the Mississippi SHPO included the appropriate USGS quadrangle map locations.

189:5

189:6 Comment noted. De Leon, an archeologist for the Forest Service, established a settlement model for the Camp Shelby area. De Leon's model has been shown to be a fair and reasonable explanation for the location of pre-historic sites at Camp Shelby. The Mississippi SHPO's office agrees with this model and has approved the survey techniques and methodology. Proponents believe these have been consistent and systematic in all survey efforts.

The types of sites discovered by all means at Camp Shelby have been predominately eroded lithic scatters. These resources are not considered eligible for the National Register. In the Camp Shelby area, these sites have been disturbed by early farming practices, World War I and II training activities, private and public forestry practices and continued training by the National Guard. The 100+ years of intensive land uses within this relatively small area has destroyed any site integrity these lithic scatters may have once had.

189:6

The Federal government is required to "...locate, inventory, and nominate to the Secretary of the Interior all sites, buildings, districts, and objects under their jurisdiction or control that appear to qualify for listing on the National Register of Historic Places" (Executive Order 11593, Sec. 2(a) 1971).

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (PL 89-665) states "With the advice of the Secretary and in cooperation with the State Historic Preservation Officer for the state involved, each Federal agency shall establish a program to locate, inventory, and nominate to the Secretary all properties under the agency's ownership or control by the agency, that appear to qualify for inclusion on the National Register in accordance with the regulations promulgated under section 101(a)(2)(A). Each Federal agency shall exercise caution to assure that any such property that might qualify for inclusion is not inadvertently transferred, sold, demolished, substantially altered, or allowed to deteriorate significantly."

36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties, Regulations of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Governing the Section 106 Process states, "(b) Locating historic properties. In consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Agency Official shall make a reasonable and good faith effort to identify historic properties that may be affected by the undertaking and gather sufficient information to evaluate the eligibility of these properties for the National Register.

Responses to Comments 189:6 and 189:10 Continued on the Following Page.

(Continuation of Response 189:6) Efforts to identify historic properties should follow the Secretary's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation (48 FR 44716) and agency programs to meet the requirements of Section 110(a)(2) of the Act. (e) "Historic Property" means any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in the National Register. This term includes, for the purposes of these regulations, artifacts, records, and remains that are related to an located within such properties. The term "eligible for inclusion in the National Register" includes both properties formally determined as such by the Secretary of the Interior and all other properties that meet National Register listing criteria.

The Mississippi National Guard has made a reasonable and good faith effort to locate and identify potentially eligible properties within Camp Shelby.

189:10 Our survey effort was not designed to move a pre-determined amount of earth. We did not calculate the quantity earth excavated. As explained in Comment 189:9, our efforts were based on locating archeological sites. Given the survey environment at HP 40, auger tests were the best and most efficient means to located potentially significant archeological sites.

Area	depth of test	shovel test	4" bucket	# tests	shovel test interval	time (approx)	possible	max	avg	# sites	discarded	probable	for HP	Comments
#31	1"	yes	no	15	unknown	8 hours	2	37.43						
#32	1"	yes	no	?	(150')	8 hours	1	37.43						
#33	none	yes	yes	?	25-15?	8 hours	C	37.43						
#34	1-3"	yes	yes	34*	20-15?	16 hours	0	37.43						* equal to 4 shovel tests
#35	3"	yes	yes	?	25-20?	16 hours	2	37.43						* not a HP
#36*	none	no	no	?	?	3.2 hours	0	?						
#37*	?	no	no	?	?	3.2 hours	1	37.43						* 3 of area (the part in vegetation not surveyed)
#38	?	no	no	?	?	3.2 hours	0	37.43						
#39	?	no	no	?	?	3.2 hours	0	37.43						
#40	3-7"	no	yes	?	5-10'	3.2 hours	1	37.43						* see comment next page

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
James and Jane Sharp

903 Farnsworth Avenue
Pascagoula, MS 39567
February 26, 1992

Thomas M. Craven
Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

We are opposed to the expanding of tank training in the
DeSoto National forest.

The Wildlife Management Area is the oldest in the state and
if taken over by M1 tanks, which weigh over 60 tons, over
20,000 acres of trees would be clear cut or thinned and
would virtually destroy the Leaf River Wildlife Management
Area. This would cause the loss of timber revenues by the
massive clear cutting and threaten endangered protected
animals and plants and would limit public access to the
Wildlife Management area.

We believe the loss of additional forest lands to the military
would diminish our quality of life, and for these reasons we
are adamantly opposed to any expansion of the military in
DeSoto National Forest.

Yours truly,

James M. Sharp
Jane P. Sharp

James M. and Jane Sharp

190:1 Comment noted. See response to comment 21:6 and general misconception
statement 5.

190:2 See response to comment 21:2.

190:3 See response to comment 21:3.

190:4 See response to comment 102:5.

190:5 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 3:12 and 17:5 Please
refer to misconceptions 9 and 14.

190:1

190:5

190:2

190:3

190:4

190:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Steve Shepard

P.O. Box 514
Gautier, MS 39553
1-601-497-3208
February 21, 1992

Thomas M. Craven
Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

It is one of the biggest mistakes in Mississippi's recent history to allow the National Guard to freely abuse Leaf River Game Management Area.

Lumber jobs will be permanently lost as a result of the clearing of the land.

Erosion will result on a massive scale and will be difficult to repair as long as tanks return year after year.

The threat to endangered species is of special concern. Besides the flippancy dismissal of endangerment to gopher tortoises and red-cockaded woodpeckers, I am under the impression that no data has been compiled about the probable threat this development has on the future of the Gulf of Mexico Sturgeon which breeds somewhere in the Pascagoula/Leaf/Chicasawhay/Black Creek/Red Creed River system.

Until a thorough study is undertaken which determines the breeding site or sites of the Gulf of Mexico Sturgeon, the tank field should not be opened up anywhere near the Leaf River or Black Creek or Black Creek's tributaries.

Sturgeons must have relatively clear bottom on which to deposit eggs. There is evidence to suggest that if a breeding area becomes unsuitable, the population of sturgeons will become extinct rather than find another suitable location. The M 1-A tanks will likely contribute siltation to the nearby waterways and do most of this damage in the summer time when sturgeons breed.

You ought to be ashamed of yourself for going along with this harmful and useless plan. The Pentagon—if left alone—would certainly close down Camp Shelby entirely as a money-saving option. Instead, because of political pressures to provide military welfare to the Hattiesburg area, individuals such as yourself choose to pretend that no damage will occur and this tank field is a military necessity. Future generations of Mississippians will curse all who chose to sell out our most important resource. Your name may be forgotten but your crime will live on as an ugly scar. While great men leave monuments behind, you will leave a holocaust in Mississippi's formerly beautiful forest.

Sincerely,

Steve Shepard
Steve Shepard
P.O. Box 514
Gautier, MS 39553

191:1 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 14.

191:2 See response to comment 21:5.

191:3 Please see response to comments 10:5 and 14:46.

191:4 Please see response to comments 1:2, 123:6, 123:7, and 123:8.

191:5 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 2:6, 3:12, and 17:5. Refer to misconceptions 2 and 25.

191:1

191:2

191:3

191:4

191:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Robert Shows

192:1 Comment noted.

192:2 Comment noted. It is not projected that Camp Shelby would undergo significant personnel reductions under any but Alternative 6.

February 27, 1992

Senator Trent Lott
245 East Capitol St.
Jackson, MS 39201

Dear Senator Lott:

As a civilian employee of the Camp Shelby Training Site, and a member of the Installation Support Unit, Camp Shelby, Mississippi Army National Guard, I am greatly concerned for the future of Camp Shelby, and employment thereof. Being fully aware of the available alternatives for land use at Camp Shelby, under the provisions of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I am unequivocally in favor of Alternative 1. With the "Draw-Down" of active component forces, the guard and reserve will receive more and more critical missions. We need space to train for these missions. We are not asking for more land to expand the Training Site, just a re-configuration to make our training more realistic because the key to successful training is realism.

Please consider the number of people who would likely be forced to move elsewhere if Alternative 1 is not chosen. Camp Shelby could become a virtually empty Installation, and over 100,000 annual troops would be forced to train at other locations.

Thank you for your serious consideration to this matter.

Sincerely,

Robert C. Shows

192:1

192:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Douglas Sims

111N 33rd. Ave. Apt. E-11
Hattiesburg, MS 39401

r

Thomas M. Craven
Mobile District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
CESAM-PD-EI
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Thomas M. Craven:

I feel that the "Land Steal" is one of the worst of many political debacles to occur in recent years. This is a blatant attempt to salvage a military training base for National Guard soldiers, not an attempt to improve the training area and facilities of Camp Shelby. The inefficiencies of the National Guard (ie. 155th Armored Division) that appeared during the Gulf War, were not related to inadequate amounts of land area or facilities, but rather inadequate land use management and an overall severe case of apathy. The "Land Steal" will only make more land available for misuse and mismanagement. I propose that NO land in the Desoto National Forest, specifically the Leaf River Wildlife other use besides recreational usage. Unlike the proposal by Management Area (LRWMA), be allocated for military use or any the Mississippi Sierra Club & Citizens Against the Land Steal, where they agree with Alternative 3B, I feel that to give a little to these people would be signaling to them that we do not care and that they can have all the land. A simple case of "give an inch take a yard" would surely ensue. Instead, I propose that the land already available for National Guard use at Camp Shelby, be used more wisely and effectively. With the proposed military cuts that President Bush has stated, there may not even be a need for this "Land Steal" to occur, and before any unnecessary irreversible environmental damage can be done, this "Land Steal" must be stopped.

I will briefly mention some of the numerous irreversible events that will occur in this area if the "Land Steal" does take place. The clearing of land, the maneuvering of tanks, the building of facilities to house supplies and other materials necessary for tank maintenance, noise pollution, etc, will cause tremendous irreversible damage to the area of concern. This damage includes depletion of important soils, flora, fauna, waterways, recreation areas, etc. Once one of these aspects are affected by the damaging preparation for the tank maneuvers or the maneuvers themselves, a "domino effect" will occur affecting many more parts of the fragile ecosystem of the area, as well as neighboring ecosystems.

I feel that we have a basic case of greed and self servitude. No one in the LRWMA will benefit, financially or environmentally, from this abduction, and neither will the nation. It is a sad

194:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 2:6, 16:7, and .

194:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6 and misconceptions 5, 8, 14, and 19.

194:3 Comment noted. See response to comments 2:6, 2:31, 3:12, 17:5 and 74:2 and general misconception statements 8 and 9.

194:4 See response to comments 74:2, and 188:2.

194:1

194:2

194:3

194:4

day when the selfish needs of so few over ride the needs and wants of so many. When the previously proposed Land Swap was confronted with feverous disapproval from the people, a "Land Steal" was initiated. This action can be considered no better than devious searchings for loopholes in the Democratic System. I think that the people behind this move need to re-consider or consider for the first time the real motives behind the "Land Steal" and its environmental impact, for I believe if they would, they would see their injustices to the majority of people in this region, to the American People as a whole, and to America the Beautiful.

194:5

Respectfully,

Douglas C. Sims

Douglas C. Sims

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
E.L. and Margaret Slater

9210 Scenic River Drive
Biloxi, Ms. 39532
February 25, 1992

Mr. Thomas M. Craven
Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, Al 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

Be advised that my Wife and I are strongly opposed to the further destruction of the Desoto National Forest for an expanded training site for the U. S. Army.

It is a well known scientific fact that the continuing destruction of trees is having an adverse effect on the ozone layer, and is upsetting the ecological balance of nature, not to mention the devastating effect it is having on our wildlife. How can we, on one hand, try to encourage people to plant trees to help the ozone situation, and on the other hand have mass destruction for some unjustifiable reason. In addition, the lumber and paper industry will suffer greatly, as well as jobs, from this wanton type of destruction. This is not a simple matter of controlled cutting of trees, but the total destruction of the ecosystem by these 60 ton tanks. With our current and future warfare technology, there are certainly alternatives to the further destruction of our environment.

It is bad enough that developers want to destroy all trees and vegetation, and cover an area with concrete for the sake of ease in construction, but now the Federal government, who should be looking out for the interest of future generations, is joining forces to compound the problem. With the dissolution of the Soviet Union there is no longer a cold war. There are massive cutbacks in our forces in Europe, and throughout the world. The performance of our Armed Forces in Desert Storm last year proves that we have the capability to defend ourselves. So why is it necessary for us to continuously upset the ecological balance of nature by further destruction of the very thing we should be making every effort to protect, our forest, wildlife, and most of all our planet.

195:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 3:12 and 17:5 and general misconception statements 5 and 9.

195:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:3 and 35:27.

195:3 See response to comment 21:2 and 21:5.

195:4 See response to comment 21:3, 3:12 and 17:5.

195:5 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 2:31 and 2:310.

195:6 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6, 35:12 and misconception 8.

195:7 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 3:12 and 17:5 and misconception 9.

195:1

195:2

195:3

195:4

195:5


195:6

195:7

Last week I attended a briefing by the U. S. Fisheries and Wildlife Service on their efforts to protect our wetlands from this same type of wanton destruction. Couple this with the U. S. Army wanting to destroy our forest, and we have a problem that must be stopped.

We urge you to take these issues into consideration in your decision, and think of the devastating effect that this action will have on both the economy and our environment.


E. L. Slater


Margaret J. Slater

195:7

This Page Intentionally Left Blank (Response 195:7 on Previous Page)

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
T. Mark Sledge

SLEDGE & STEVENS
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
503 SOUTH STATE STREET
P. O. Box 1021
JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39215-1021

TELEPHONE
(601) 354-0044
FACSIMILE
(601) 900-5592

February 19, 1992

Mr. Thomas M. Craven
U. S. Army Corp of Engineers
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001

RE: Proposed expansion of Camp Shelby, Perry County, Mississippi

Dear Mr. Craven:

I wanted to take this opportunity to voice my objection to the proposed expansion of Camp Shelby into the DeSoto National Forest in Perry County, Mississippi.

My reasons for opposing this expansion are numerous. In the first place, during a period of time that our government is substantially reducing its military, and in particular, our government has chosen to halt the production of the M-1 tank; there is no legitimate reason to add more than 20,000 acres of forest to the Camp Shelby tank training area. As the environmental impact statement concludes, it is apparent that the wildlife management area which is proposed to be consumed by Camp Shelby will be virtually destroyed resulting in the loss of the oldest wildlife management area in the State of Mississippi; the loss of timber revenues from massive clear cutting; and damage to the fragile eco systems which involve protected animals and plants. This is especially the case since the military has yet to identify an established mission or necessity for consuming this beautiful and fragile forest.

The DeSoto National Forest and the wildlife management area which Camp Shelby proposes to consume for the purpose of tank maneuvers provide significant recreational facilities to citizens of Mississippi, as well as visitors across the country. I certainly hope that the U. S. Army Corp of Engineers will agree that to permit Camp Shelby to annex over 20,000 acres of forest will be not only needless and senseless, but will result in significant damage to the environment as well as a diminished quality of life for the citizens of Mississippi, and especially for those citizens who live nearby and adjacent to the proposed tank training area.

Sincerely,

T. MARK SLEDGE

TMS/mh

- 196:1 Comment noted. See responses to comments 21:6 and 21:8. See general misconception statements 5 and 12.
- 196:2 See responses to comments 2:6, 21:7, 35:12, and 53:4.
- 196:3 Comment Noted. Please refer to misconceptions 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, and 16.
- 196:4 See response to comment 21:2.
- 196:5 See response to comment 21:3.

2/17/92

The following are my comments on the Draft EIS:

1. p. 25-1 (4th paragraph). What is the current military doctrine? How in this present and foreseeable climate of ever increasing world peace can you are say that the same number of troops and vehicles will be used as current training? This EIS is fatally flawed from the very first page!
2. 33-2 (2nd paragraph) What mandate? Where was your mandate in the Persian Gulf war where the National Guard Armoured Combat Group was "seemed so unfit for combat that they spent the whole war in the U.S.?" The mandate according to the Pentagon is to go with light armoured combat readiness with quick mobilization. This leaves out 60 ton dinosaur tanks. These tanks were designed for the Cold War Era European Theater. Who are you trying to fool? See exhibit A. LURS study (Oct 1990) is insignificant now based on world events since then. LURS is based on a bonafied, realistic mission statement which the National Guard presently does not have.
3. 33-9 (2nd last paragraph) If long term needs (beyond 10 years) for training requirements have not been clearly defined, what right do you have to propose actions which will have a long term impact on the National Forest environment?
4. 33-9 (noise) Who are you trying to fool? On Jan. 26, 1992, the noise was so loud from 6-11 p.m. that the windows in people's houses shook as far south as Saucier. Documentation of this is filled with range control. These noise disturbances from bombing on the Impact Area occur often enough to be a significant impact, yet you show 0 impact for alt.s 1-5.
5. 1-1(3rd paragraph) How can Dept. of Army make a commitment of manpower and resources in ROD when the military's budget from month to month is so uncertain? What provision is there in the EIS for reevaluation and revision of Special Use Permit as budget cuts occur? Also, what restoration provisions?
6. 1-7 (1st paragraph) How is military abuse of National Forest land in a climate of world peace consistent with the overall Forest Service objectives that cannot be serviced by development on private land? Why does tank training need to occur on DeSoto NF? Why not consolidate tank training at Fort Irwin, Calif. for example? These questions need to be addressed in this EIS.
7. 1-8 (1st paragraph) If you want to talk realistic, who is your enemy and what likelihood will the battle occur on forest land in the post Soviet Union world? If you really want to talk realistic, what are the chances of the National Guard participating based on their performance in the Persian Gulf and the success accomplished without them?
8. Why is Memorandum of Understanding not attached in the Appendix? (p. 1-10). Is this the same document included in Facilities EIS entitled MASTER AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE DEPT. OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE signed Sept. 1988? This document states that land exchange will be explored as an alternative or mitigating measure when military training activities are not in conformance with the affected Forest Plan. It is definite that actions proposed in the EIS for tank maneuvering and current use activities such as impact area, ammunition dump, firing points, firing ranges, east and west air/ground ranges, etc. are not in conformance with the Forest Plan which is to guide all natural resource management activities for NF's in MS. Why is land interchange not addressed as mitigating or alternative measure in this EIS?
9. p. 1-12. What is relationship between this EIS and Facilities EIS? Since they are connected and cumulative, ROD for this EIS could affect ROD for the other. Will there be another draft of Facilities EIS pending outcome of this EIS? It would have been better to combine the two. Now, there is unnecessary complexity and discontinuity.

- 197:1 Comment noted. Commentor is correct when he suggests that national troops strength will decrease measurably. Camp Shelby however, becomes more important because the National Guard role vis-a-vis the regular Army is increasing in many areas rather than growing smaller. Please also see response to comment 2:6.
- 197:2 Comment noted. The National Guard and Camp Shelby do continue to have such a mission. See also response to comment 2:6.
- 197:3 See response to comments 2:6, 2:31, 3:12 and 17:5.
- 197:4 All comparisons are with present conditions, including the present military training activities. This is acknowledged not to be the same as having no environmental effect.
- 197:5 See response to comment 7:4. The Special Use Permit (SUP) may be amended by agreement of both parties at any time. Thus, should the National Guard training needs change, the SUP could be amended as necessary. It should be noted that the permit is for a ten year period and will be re-issued following a determination of need as stated in the Master Agreement between the Secretaries of Agriculture and Defense (Appendix A). See Appendix A-2, clause 35 restoration provisions.
- 197:6 Commentor's reference to private land is unclear. See responses to comments 2:31, 30:2, and 185:2.
- 197:7 Training is conducted in Mississippi to provide for needs of Army National Guard units whose members live in Mississippi and adjacent states. See also responses to comments 2:6, 2:31, 30:2, and 185:2.
- 197:8 The likelihood of land warfare taking place in a forested area in Eurasia is uncomfortably high in the minds of many observers. See also response to comment 2:6.
- 197:9 See response to comment 2:4 and 2:5.
- 197:10 See responses to comments 176:2 and 30:2.
- 197:11 Land interchange was originally proposed, as the commentor will recall.
- 197:12 Preparers agree that one document might have some advantages over two, however the training area development was proposed after the Final EIS for the other proposal was in process. The ROD for the current EIS will include the cumulative effects of the Facilities EIS.

197:13 The nature of the training is varied beyond ability to describe fully, since they occupy tens of thousands of pages of Army manuals, but the major elements have been summarized in Section 1.2.8 of the Final EIS.

197:14 Comment noted. See also response to comment 2:164.

197:15 These changes have been made in the Final EIS by the Forest Service cooperating personnel. With one exception, this loss is small, a few dozen acres now in active management.

197:16 Comment noted. Extensive additions have been made to graphics to add local references. FS administrative maps are not of a scale or clarity which is useful to the overall project needs, but one FS map has been used as the base map for Figure 1-3 to provide a more familiar basis for orientation throughout the document.

197:17 To minimize effects on older forest, all sites are located in recently harvested areas, and include some replanted sites. Final site location will be evaluated in a site specific environmental analysis should the project be permitted. There are no plans to compensate the Forest Service for its investment in plantations which will be removed. See also the response to comment 42:12.

197:18 The issue is one of concurrent use. These sites represent "behind the lines" regrouping and rest areas. While it is appropriate for some of the sites to be used (at different times) for both the maneuver and aircraft, some sites need to be separate because of these varying needs.

197:19 The reference to a restoration project is not clear. The site specific analyses for each training area, described in Section 1.4 of the Final EIS, will include provisions for revegetation and structural erosion control structures as appropriate. MSARNG will comply with AR 200-2 and NEPA requirements in this effort.

197:20 If the drainage is a designated wetland, then crossing will be restricted to a small number of improved crossings. If the slopes approaching the channel exceed 10%, even if the area is not a wetland, then tracked vehicles will not maneuver there. If the area meets neither criterion, there are proposed to be no particular restrictions.

197:21 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 10:8 and 10:9 and Clause 47 of the proposed SUP (Appendix A of the Final EIS).

197:22 Comment noted. Text has been changed.

197:23 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:31, 21:6, 26:4, 28:3, and 30:2.

197:24 See response to comment 51:1 and 176:31.

197:25 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6 and 35:12 and misconception 8.

197:26 Responses to comments 197:26, 197:27, 197:28, and 197:29 are on the following page

10. all throughout the EIS, the term "training requirements" is mentioned. These training requirements need to be made known to the public in order to better evaluate purpose and need. How would effectiveness of training be measured? How do we know that realistic training can even be accomplished?

11. p.1-39. Alt. 6 should include contaminated land also. NG should be responsible for all decontamination or else trade to the the FS land which they own within NF Proclamation Boundary.

12. p.25-5. Needs to include acres taken out of productive land base not only for tank maneuvering but also all proposed facilities.

13. Maps used in this EIS for location of proposed activities in Description of the Action Section are worthless for public to evaluate. There are no legal descriptions, roads, or natural features to determine location. Suggest using FS administrative maps.

14. p.1-55 Are any of these sites located in plantations and if so, would FS be reimbursed for destruction of these investments?

Also, why can't tactical aviation sites be located in the cleared areas for tank maneuvering?

15. Will a site specific environmental assessment be done for all watershed restoration projects? Will tanks cross unprotected ephemeral drains? If so, how will they be protected?

15a. Need to state that all sites surveyed by NG for cultural resources will need SHPO concurrence before implementation, even if no sites are found.

16. p.3-3 Change Wild and Scenic to Scenic only.

17. p.3-5. Noise generated from military operations is in direct conflict with having a recreational experience in the purest sense. Re-Creation of the mind, body, and spirit is what it is all about. People visit National Forests to get away from it all. How can this be done when military jets are flying overhead and sounds of distant bombing are in the air? I imagine for most people that to be reminded of war while supposedly trying to have a recreational experience is too much to bear. Why in this time of present and ever increasing world peace do we have to be subjected to this? Is this in keeping with the purpose of National Forests? The sounds of thunder is what we should be hearing, not tank firing.

18. p.3-17 Need to extend harvest periods on out to end of rotation.

19. p.3-23 (last paragraph) How can you possibly say that Camp Shelby is a stable source of employment in that region and will become proportionately more important to the regional economy when the peace dividend will most certainly increase over time? Les Aspin, Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, on Feb. 22, 1992 recommended 114 billion dollars in cuts over the next 5 year period. President Bush in his State of the Union Address recommended \$50 billion. Troop strength will inevitably be cut sooner rather than later. In contrast, the forest products industry will continue to increase. The U.S will be relying on forest products from the southern pine region to meet increasing demand, and as a result of this, employment and the regional economy will continue to improve. Exports of forest products from this region will also continue to increase. This is not addressed.

20. p.3-25 The noise from tank traffic needs to be addressed.

21. p.3-26. It takes 15 years for compacted soils to recover provided no further compaction occurs during this period. Need to correct this misstatement.

22. p.3-65 "for areas that have less than a 10% slope a 33 buffer is sufficient to protect the associated wetlands" is incorrect. The minimum slope where this would be correct is 2% since 30 plus 1.5 times 2% equals 33 feet.

197:26 Comment noted. Preparers believe that conjecture over the future of the timber industry in the South and how this relates to a need for National Forest timber production will not assist in assisting in an informed decision. Please also see response to comment 176:31.

197:27 Coverage has been added to the Final EIS. See also response to comment 21:4.

197:28 Coverage has been added on this issue in Sections 3.1.1.3.2 and 3.5.2 of the Final EIS.

197:29 Comment noted. The adequacy of the buffer for intrusion protection was more in the mind of the writer than adequacy for trapping silt. For simplicity's sake the buffer agreed-to will be 100 feet, which is more than enough to allow for a 10% slope, and slopes greater than 10% will not be used for tracked vehicle maneuver.

197:30 Comment noted. The National Guard's usage is controlled by the provisions of the Special Use Permit, and its requirements will be followed in development of training areas.

197:31 Comment noted. Revised permit requirements may affect the need for site specific permits.

197:32 See response to comment 197:24 and additional coverage in Section 3.3.2.3.1 of the Final EIS.

197:33 Extensive additional coverage on longleaf pine has been added. See response to comment 1:10.

197:34 Source of commentor's data is not clear. Table 3-19 (Section 3.3.1.4) shows the total acreage of the MPRC-H site to be from about 1,800 to 2,500 acres, and Table 3-21 (Section 3.3.2.3) shows the acreage of longleaf pine to be cleared as about 480 acres for both sites. See also the response to comment 51:1.

197:35 The use of Present Net Value is an internal Forest Service requirement, and it will undoubtedly be by that agency used in reaching a decision. Preparers do not see it as an environmental concern in NEPA terms.

197:36 Comment noted. Clause 35 of the Special Use Permit provides for National Guard compensation for the cost of reforestation on these returned lands.

197:37 The acreages which remain suitable for harvest are included in Appendix O, pages O-75 through O-83.

197:38 The timber growth loss from areas cleared for current tank training areas and that would now be returned, to regular National Forest management under the various alternatives, is not germane to the question of issuing a special use permit. Therefore, there are no plans to calculate it.

197:39 Please see response to comments 1:2, 1:4 and 1:33.

Responses to comments 197:43 through 197:49 are on the following page

23. Why are impacts to visual resources not discussed? If the Forest Service is directed by LRP to mitigate according to Visual Quality Objectives (VQO), why not the NG? Commentor's concern is that the NG is now being revised and a separate COE permit may be required pending decision on Nationwide permit.

24. p. 3-67 Need to state that COE Nationwide Permit for wetlands is decision on Nationwide permit.

24. p. 3-80 Need to figure returns to counties based on 60 year term since maturity of longleaf occurs then.

25. The effects on loss of longleaf was not addressed (See exhibit B). Longleaf pine is rapidly decreasing throughout its range. The National Forests are the inevitable safety net for perpetuation of the longleaf pine ecosystem.

26. Using the primary MPACH, 6,592 acres of longleaf are proposed for clearing, alt. 2-5714. This is a significant amount of longleaf acreage taken out of production. This does not include the so-called thinned areas which will be ruined. What percent of longleaf will be removed compared to the other pine species? Longleaf pine has a high market value for poles which the other species do not have. Does the Timber Summary by Alternative Table address this? This table and the one below it need to be evaluated for periods 5 and 6 also. Why is FNV not used to compare alternatives?

27. The Forest Service should be compensated by the NG for all land returned to productive land class which was cleared for tank maneuvering (See Table 3-12). How much of turnback acreage in each alt. has been cleared for tank maneuvering? What was the lost timber revenues based on growth lost from time of removal? This should be addressed.

28. p. 3-85 How can public evaluate alt.s when Biological Opinions for gopher tortoise and RCW management have not been prepared yet? Will ROD be delayed until ROD for Long Term Management of RCW is signed?

29. p. 3-85 Will another field survey of Automated Tank Table VIII be conducted prior to implementation to check for gopher tortoises which have moved in since last survey?

30. How does alt. 5 (Vol. Summary-p. 3-94) compare in value with effect of C. Shelby on regional economy? How would jobs created with alt. 5 compare with jobs lost at C. Shelby? Need to extend to 60 year period.

31. p. 3-96 Need to address cumulative effects of annual fertilization of disturbed areas compared to natural undisturbed state. Artificial fertilization is considered as a pollutant to the environment. Need to address adverse visual effects of annual revegetation program as compared to undisturbed state.

32. p. 3-99 Need to discuss cumulative negative visual impact from all the signs and fences posted to keep the National Guard from causing environmental destruction. The number of these signs required for environmental protection from alt. 1 alone would be absolutely horrendous. Is this what we want to see in our National Forests?

33. p. 3-102. What happens to ITAM when military budget is cut? Will it be the first or last to go? Training should be commensurate with ITAM funding. This needs to be so stated. What assurances do we have that 100% of all disturbed areas will be revegetated soon after AT

33:38? 3-113 What about setting up monitoring stations on creeks affected by the selected alternative? How many and how intensive? These questions must be addressed here. In addition to water monitoring, soil monitoring should be conducted.

197:40 None of the alternatives are likely to conflict with RCW recovery. The ROD for this EIS will be signed after the DEIS for management of the RCW is issued. This may or may not occur before the RCW ROD is signed. Additional informal consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service may be required when the site specific environmental analysis is being prepared.

197:41 Additional surveys to update the data presented in the Draft EIS have been made more than once. Further surveys will be made prior to implementation. The actions to be taken in implementing Tank Table VIII are outlined thoroughly in the current Biological Opinion of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the EIS.

197:42 It's doubtful if Alternative 5 would create any new jobs. This economic area is one of tight timber markets. Selection of Alternative 5 may prevent closure or consolidation of some wood processing facilities by ensuring a supply of raw material, but it probably won't result in creation of an appreciable amount of new jobs.

Response to comment 197:34 is found on the previous page

197:43 In response to this and related comments, a new study of possible effects of fertilization on water quality was prepared for the Final EIS. As a result fertilization recommendations especially for nitrogen have been modified. See also Section 3.4.5.5 of the Final EIS and Appendix S.

197:44 All comparisons in the EIS are with present conditions, including ongoing military training activities.

197:45 Comment noted. Preparers agree that a balance is required between the number of signs which the Forest Service requires and that required to necessary wetlands and other sensitive areas.

197:46 Please see response to comment 7:4.

197:47 Please see response to comments 10:5 and 14:46.

197:48 Water quality monitoring is now established on all watersheds leaving Camp Shelby. Please also see response to comments 20:5 and 20:6.

197:49 The monitoring of soil is a part of the long term LCTA process.

197:50 Coverage for Tank Table VIII is made in full in the Final EIS. This distinction has been made more clear in Sections 1.3 and 1.5.

197:51 Comment noted. See coverage in Section 3.3.2.3 and Appendix O of the Final EIS.

197:52 See additional coverage in old Section 3.2.2.3 and response to Commentor #141, comment #10.

197:53 See responses to comments 2:6 and 197:35.

197:54 Comment noted. No proposal is made to further decontaminate the surface use lands referred to.

197:55 When soils are totally saturated, little or no pressure is transferred to the soil particle structure. It is when soils are plastic, rather than fully saturated, that compaction damage is most likely.

197:56 The management of maneuver when soils are wet has been the subject of extended discussion among the parties involved, and a decision matrix has been proposed (Section 3.3.4.1 and Figure 3-62 of the Final EIS) in which such decisions are examined and outcomes presented.

197:57 See additional coverage in Section 3.5.4.2 and Appendix U of the Final EIS.

197:58 Comment noted. Please also see responses to comments 2:6 and misconceptions 3, 8, and 25.

197:59 Comment Noted. Preparers acknowledge that, relying on biological data alone, the historical and social, as opposed to the present uses, of the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area, had led to some underestimation of these issues. Extensive coverage has been added to the Final EIS which examines such issues. Please see Sections 2.4.6, 3.1.6, 3.3.6, and 3.5.12 of the Final EIS, and the response to comment 10:1 and the discussion of misconception 14.

197:60 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 2:6 and 197:23 and misconception 8.

197:61 Comment noted.

35. p. 3-121(2nd last paragraph) Does this mean that site specific EA will be done for Automated Tank Table VIII also?
36. p. 3-124. The forestry section is wishy washy. Will loss of timber production be mitigated by purchase of additional land or not? Need to state in no uncertain terms. This could be a very significant mitigation since there are currently 39,100 acres taken out of the productive timber base because of dominate military use. Need to state amount of acres by alt. that needs to be reforested when tank maneuver areas are turned back and estimate how much it would cost.
37. There needs to be a cost analysis done for each alt. showing how much the environmental mitigation will cost the NG. After all, the taxpayers need to know to weigh the costs and benefits of military training, especially since there is not a bonafied need to train intensively in non-threatening world now anyway.
38. p. 3-125 So far the only decontaminated land mentioned is the impact area. What about all the surface use only area which has to be decontaminated? It should be part of each action alternative to decontaminate all the surface use only land.
39. p. 3-126 How can soil compaction be least when soil is saturated? How will it be known when heavy equipment should not be allowed based on soil conditions which vary considerably? Let's be practical! (p. 3-127).
40. p. 3-130 Need to state what effects each alternative will have on prescribe burning program and how that relates to effects on wildlife habitat.
41. p. 3-134. The question to be asked is not whether Camp Shelby is needed for improvement of the local economy, but should the American taxpayers spend all this money on a military facility which does not serve the needs of the nation. We need to keep in mind that National Forest belongs to all the people in this country and not be concerned about the shortsightedness of local politicians and businessmen.
42. The social impact of ruining the Leaf River Game Management Area, oldest in the State was not even mentioned? This was definitely one of the major issues identified in the scoping process and by not addressing this issue, you are in direct violation of NEPA.
43. The Purpose and Need section is a farce. We are in an era where we should be weaning ourselves away from dependence on the economy of the military-industrial complex and look what we are proposing to do now. Does this make any sense? We need to have a moratorium on all military expansion proposals until the U.S. Government coalesces a national policy. We should not be pressured into committing financial and natural resources to something which is not life supporting. Let's keep in mind what the military is trained to do-destroy human life. Is this one of the reasons National Forests were established? How does military use of National Forest land make any sense at all? There is a spiritual value to this land which has been overlooked. The silence of a vast green space such as this is precious. It is designed for nurture life, and not serve as a training ground for destruction of life. We are constantly being reminded of death and destruction through the activities of the National Guard. Is this what we want the children of our citizens to grow up with? Would God, whoever you conceive Him to be, bless what man is proposing to do here? If you answered that question like I did, you would have no choice but to select alternative 6.

Sincerely
Robert P. Marshall
Concerned Citizen

2 Enclosure (2 pages) attached to this letter not reproduced in this FEIS.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Benita Smith

13 FEB 1980

2-7-80

Dear Sirs:

I am writing regarding the expansion of the Camp Shelby tank maneuver area.

The Desoto National Forest is a wonderful place, and I enjoy being outdoors, hiking in that area & seeing all the wonderful birds. I cannot understand any plan that wants to clear cut 14,000 acres.

If tanks need wide open areas in which to train, why can't this training be done in Texas or New Mexico or in any state where there are vast clear areas? If the argument is "because Mississippi will lose jobs" I say "Fine. It is better to lose those jobs than to lose natural resources which we can not recreate and enjoy again." Those forests are beautiful and peaceful.

The Cold War has wound down. Let the training wind down too or move it someplace else where wonderful natural resources will be spared.

Please spare our woodlands -

Benita Smith
1616 Glenn Sweetman -
Biloxi, MS 39530

198:1

198:2

198:3

198:4

198:1 Comment noted. Please also see the response to comments 16:2, 16:3, and 21:8.

198:2 See response to comment 2:31 and misconception 16.

198:3 Comment noted. Economic benefit is not claimed, and is not used as a justification by the proponent. See Sections 3.1.4, 3.1.3.2, 3.3.3.2, and 3.3.4 of the Final EIS. Please also see response to comments 3:12 and 17:5.

198:4 Comment noted. Please also see responses to comments 2:6 and misconceptions 8, 9, and 16.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Robert Sneed

199:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 5.

199:2 Please see responses to comments 2:6 and 21:7.

199:3 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 3:12 and 17:5 and misconceptions 8, 12, and 14.

199:4 See response to comment 21:2.

199:5 See response to comment 21:3.

199:6 Comment noted. See response to comments 21:3, 21:6, and 21:8, and general misconception statements 5 and 12.

ROBERT W. SNEED

ATTORNEY AT LAW

P.O. BOX 2251

JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39225-2251

503 SOUTH STATE STREET

TELEPHONE (601) 354-0044
FAX (601) 868-5583

February 19, 1992

Mr. Thomas M. Craven
U. S. Army Corp of Engineers
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001

RE: Proposed expansion of Camp Shelby, Perry County, Mississippi

Dear Mr. Craven:

I wanted to take this opportunity to voice my objection to the proposed expansion of Camp Shelby into the DeSoto National Forest in Perry County, Mississippi. 199:1

My reasons for opposing this expansion are numerous. In the first place, during a period of time that our government is substantially reducing its military, and in particular, our government has chosen to halt the production of the M-1 tank; there is no legitimate reason to add more than 20,000 acres of forest to the Camp Shelby tank training area. As the environmental impact statement concludes, it is apparent that the wildlife management area which is proposed to be consumed by Camp Shelby will be virtually destroyed resulting in the loss of the oldest wildlife management area in the State of Mississippi; the loss of timber revenues from massive clear cutting; and damage to the fragile eco systems which involve protected animals and plants. This is especially the case since the military has yet to identify an established mission or necessity for consuming this beautiful and fragile forest. 199:2 199:3 199:4 199:5 199:6

The DeSoto National Forest and the wildlife management area which Camp Shelby proposes to consume for the purpose of tank maneuvers provide significant recreational facilities to citizens of Mississippi, as well as visitors across the country. I certainly hope that the U. S. Army Corp of Engineers will agree that to permit Camp Shelby to annex over 20,000 acres of forest will be not only needless and senseless, but will result in significant damage to the environment as well as a diminished quality of life for the citizens of Mississippi, and especially for those citizens who live nearby and adjacent to the proposed tank training area. 199:6

Sincerely,


ROBERT W. SNEED

RWS/mh

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Lydia Snell

2618 Demaret Dr.
Gulfport, MS 39507
February 27, 1992

Thomas M. Craven
Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-001

Sir:

For some time I have been corresponding with Trent Lott and Gene Taylor concerning my opposition to permitting expansion of DeSoto National Forest land for tank training.

This land is my land---it was set aside for the use and enjoyment of the people. It would be a sacrilege to allow this wilderness area to be destroyed for the purpose of tank training. There are other places in this land where trees would not have to be cut; places far more suitable for tank training....if, in fact, tank training is necessary at this time.

I resent the possible loss of any of this area for hiking and camping; just to enjoy. I further resent and possibility of damage to the area so far as loss of animal habitat and plant life.

I do not want this national forest used for any other purpose than it was set aside for.

Lydia J. Snell
Lydia J. Snell

200:1 Preparers note that neither the Black Creek nor Leaf Wilderness are within the permit area of Camp Shelby and are only indirectly affected by current and proposed military activity. Please also see response to comments 21:8 and 30:2 and general misconception statements 5, 9, 10 and 22.

200:2 See responses to comments 2:6, 2:31, 21:7, and 53:4 and misconception 16.

200:3 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 21:8 and 102:5 and misconception 22 which explains the primary goals of the National Forest.

200:4 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 2:132 and 21:3.

200:1

200:2

200:3

200:4

200:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Charles Streuly

February 27, 1992

Thomas M. Craven
Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-001


If the army needs long stretches of land, let them use old railroad beds, and existing logging roads. The impact of present training can be seen by all traveling Hwy. 29. In five years the land addition they require would look the same. Total devastation, with little hope of it ever regenerating itself.

Poor argument that the present brigade found the terrain unsuitable for action in Desert Storm. There is some difference in sand and heavily forested areas. The additional 39,000 acres still would not afford them the training they would need for another desert conflict.

Why leave the decision whether to grant the permission to one man, Mr. Kenneth R. Johnson, State Forest Supervisor.

Let the people who love the area as it is decide on its use.

I absolutely and definitely want this national forest left as is for the enjoyment of all.


Charles D. Streuly
2605 Demaret Dr.
Gulfport, MS 39507

201:1 Comment noted. Commentor's reference is not clear. No clearing of land for maneuver purposes has taken place for approximately 8 to 10 years. Please also see response to comments 3:12 and 74:2 and misconceptions 5, 8, and 9.

201:2 The terrain relationships to Desert Storm are not the basis of any proposed action. It is the lack of space and distance for realistic training which is the issue, not the nature of the terrain. See also the response to comments 2:6 and 2:31 and misconception statement 8.

201:3 The U.S. Forest Service is the federal agency responsible for administering the National Forests. The Forest Service is considered one of the most decentralized of all federal agencies in its decision making. As the line officer responsible for the administration of the National Forests in Mississippi, Mr. Johnson decides on the issuance of special use permits for these lands. His decisions are based on extensive inputs from the professional staff, regulatory agencies, and the general public. Higher authorities in the Forest Service may remand any decision for additional studies and re-consideration.

201:4 Comment noted.

201:1

201:2

201:3

201:4

February 25, 1992

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Patricia Taylor

Mr. Tom Craven
Department of the Army
Mobile District Corps of Engineers
Inland Environmental Section
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, Ala. 36628-0001

Dear Sir:

I must admit I have read and heard of the proposed takeover of the Leaf River Management Area for quite some time. Only today it really occurred to me an impact this could have, not only on our generation but generations yet to come.

To be denied the pleasure of walking under these pines so tall and strong. To see a vision of the Indians who once hunted here and depended on the game from this wilderness for their survival. To hope in years to come our grandchildren can walk through these same woods and pick up an arrowhead left here by our forefathers instead of a shell casing lying on war ravaged ground.

Why should we trade our place of beauty, peace, history and game for a piece of steel?

Please take these things into consideration for the sake of Humanity.

202:1

202:2

202:3

202:1 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 3:12 and general misconception statements 5, 12, and 23.

202:2 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 11.

202:3 Comment noted.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Patricia Taylor
11099 Woolmarket Ln Rd.
Biloxi, Ms. 39532

19: THOMAS (RAVEN) (1) 2-23-42
DEPT. OF THE ARMY
MOBILE DIST. CORP. OF ENGS. Laurel, Md.

Dear Sir,

I am writing as a concerned citizen to say that I'm 100% against the Tonk- Training Land expansion in the Desoto Forest.

Our National Forests were never intended to be destroyed so that a Tonk- Training Facility could be built. They were to be set aside and protected, to be used and enjoyed for the good of the most number of people, and future generations to come.

Over the years I've fished and hunted all over the Desoto. I've floated Black Creek many times as an Adult and earlier as a youngster in the Boy Scouts - giving the last few years during Black Creek Float trips the experience was often marred by planes overhead and artillery firing from nearby Camp Shelby.

On the main road entering Desoto a sign reads: The - Land - of - many - uses. If the Tonk Proposal goes through, many - uses becomes one - use.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
James Tims

203:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 3:12 and 30:2. See general misconception statements 5, 9, and 22.

203:2 Comment noted. See response to comments 21:4, 21:6, and 176:18.

203:1

203:2

203:3

(2)

And that's training the military.
The cons of this operation seem to far outweigh the pros'. Clearcutting 20,000 ~~acre~~ acres of forest land (including the oldest stand of forest in Mex. - the Sept River Management Area) would cause loss of forestry jobs (eventually), loss of revenue from sportsmen and families out for recreation. Local small businesses would close down. Wildlife would definitely be negatively impacted.

In light of the current world situation and cut-backs in Fed. spending for the military, the destruction of 20,000 acres of the Desert to build a Tank-Training Facility is both a bad idea and also an obsolete one. The Persian Gulf War and most likely any conflicts in the near future will be fought in a desert-type environment. Why ruin the Desert Nat. Forest when there are plenty of areas in the U.S. that would be much better suited for such a training base?

203:3 Comment noted. Please refer to response to comment 18:1 and misconceptions 9 and 16.

203:4 See response to comment 21:5.

203:5 Comment noted. See 3.3.4 and 3.5.10 of the Final EIS and response to comment 21:8.

203:6 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 203:5.

203:7 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 21:3 and 2:132.

203:8 See responses to comments 2:6, 21:7, 35:12, and 53:4 and misconceptions 8 and 9.

203:9 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:31. See general misconception statements 9 and 16.

(3)

203:10 Comment noted. Please see responses to comments 2:6, 2:31, and 197:7 and misconception 16.

As for as the Desoto Forest being an "ideal" site to build this training area, I can't see the reasoning ~~it~~. It seems to me that the logical choice for an "ideal" site to build the Tank Base would be Flame:

1. A remote area ⁱⁿ a desert area
2. few people living ~~in~~ there
3. will be types that wouldn't be as harmed as that depending on a forest as its home.

4. already devoid of trees, so no long-term cutting operation will be required

I read the newspapers and watched the news on TV, and I haven't heard anyone explain why it is so essential to ~~the~~ destroy 20,000 acres of prime forest land in the Desoto for a tank-training base - when there are all-ready many more strategically sound areas (both economically and environmentally) with-in the United States. Texas and Utah for examples. It seems that other choices have

203:9

203:10

(14)

not been thoroughly looked into.
Our selected officials of Mas.
seem to have forgotten that they
have a duty to protect and defend
the interests of its citizens. I
have yet to hear anyone of them
say that the Land-Expansion
may not be such a good idea.

So before we allow the
Dacota Nat. Forest to be destroyed,
let's take a good long look at
all the issues involved. Both the
short and long-term. Let's
take the time to ask the hard
questions about what we (the
people of Mas., the Nation, and
future generations) stand to lose
(or gain) in this deal. We
have plenty of time to do this right.

Let's keep the Dacota as
it is. To be enjoyed by the
most number of people, as it
was originally intended by our
forefathers.

Response to 203:10 on Previous Page

- 203:11 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 5.
- 203:12 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 3:12 and 17:5 and misconception 9.
- 203:13 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 5, 9, and 22.

203:10

203:11

203:12

203:13

(5)

Because once the clear-
cutting begins, the forest will
be gone forever.

respectfully,

James A. Tins

203:13

446

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Sally Todd

- 204:1 Comment noted. Please see misconception 5.
204:2 See response to comment 21:2.
204:3 See response to comment 21:3.
204:4 See response to comment 21:5.
204:5 See response to comment 21:6.
204:6 See responses to comments 21:7, 2:6, and 53:4.
204:7 See response to comment 21:8.

Mr. Thomas Claver,
I am writing in opposition to
expanded task training in the Alaska
National Forest. There are several reasons
for this opposition excluding: (1) loss
of timber revenues (2) damage to roads
and plots (3) loss of forestry and forest
related jobs (4) what their expansion
will do to people living near their
task training (5) no established mission
in need, especially considering recent
reduction in the milling and
timber production in the M-Tank
(6) loss of recreational facilities to
visitors across the country.

Sincerely,
Sally Todd
Fletcher, MA

2-25-92

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Joan Trahan

Mr. Cronon

Please keep us to stop the expanded tank training of Arctic National Forest.

The Wildlife Management Area around the abolished after so many years of progress that thousands of jobless people are waiting to be employed.

The trees alone are worth more to our nation than any possible training asset. Surely there are other barren lands that could be used.

Please do not destroy all of these trees & plants, recreational facilities, homes & habitat for thousands of animals, the forest related jobs! A true natural beauty of an area that at this time is unique.

As a native of Mississippi I ask that your help is needed to stop this project.
Thank you.

Joan Wentzell Trahan
414 Alderson Place
Bellevue, MO. 63130

205:1 Comment noted. Please see misconception 5.

205:2 Comment noted. Please refer response to comment 14:28 and misconceptions 14 and 23.

205:3 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 2:6 and 2:31 and misconception 16.

205:4 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:2, 21:3, 3:12, and 17:5.

205:5 See response to comment 21:8, 16:2 and 16:3.

205:6 See response to comment 21:3.

205:7 See response to comment 21:5.

205:8 Comment noted.

205:1

205:2

205:3

205:4

205:5

205:6

205:7

205:8

205:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF Jeff Troyka

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PREPARE FAMILY

Name: <u>JEFF TROYKA</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Address: <u>37 FERNWOOD DRIVE</u>		Hattiesburg, MS	
City: <u>LAUREL, MS</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39400</u>	Date: <u>January 9, 1992</u>

Comment/Question: 1 Resource Area: Natural Resources

The EIS clearly defines the mission of the USFS. The USFS has already compromised its principles with the existing SUP allowing tank maneuvering. By granting a SUP allowing additional forest destruction, the USFS will deviate from its mission even more. Undoubtedly this process will continue indefinitely as the need for more land increases. It is time for the USFS to assert itself as to its reason for being by saying NO to any type of forest destruction and in particular tank maneuvering. Otherwise grant the military outright title as they wanted originally and stop the farce that tank maneuvering is somehow compatible with "a sustained flow of renewable resources -- outdoor recreation, forage, wood, water, wilderness, wildlife and fish -- in a combination that best meets the needs of society now and in the future".

Comment/Question: 2 Resource Area: Military

With the reduced threat of a major international conflict the alternate proposals in the EIS are moot. The issue needs to be tabled until the various government agencies and bureaus reevaluate their missions and priorities. For example, some people think the NG was unprepared for the Gulf War. Perhaps the NG should handle domestic conflicts and let our full time professional military deal with the more serious situations such as the Gulf War. In my opinion the career US military person is the finest in the world. Let them handle our sophisticated weapons systems.

Comment/Question: 3 Resource Area: Nat'l vs Local Economics

The federal deficit, to be paid by future taxpayers, is a national disgrace. The Hattiesburg area will benefit from federal dollars for something for which a need has not been convincingly demonstrated. The rest of society has to pay for it, either now or in the future. The USFS is self-supporting and to replace local USFS jobs with taxpayer supported jobs just doesn't make sense.

Comment/Question: 4 Resource Area: Human Resources

Perhaps the talent and brainpower used to fuel the military machine could be used more effectively to invent some type of tank training simulator similar to pilot training. With runaway federal spending and a peaceful world climate, the allocation of our limited natural and human resources to wealth draining activities is not what our country needs to compete in the global economy.

Comment/Question: 5 Resource Area: Political & Economic

Our local political leaders, the local business community and the NG all have the same motive; namely - let's do what's best for me now. Why not? The political counterparts across the country have their own pork barrels going so why shouldn't we get ours? It is too bad that this thinking serves to gradually undermine our nation's competitive position in the world economy over the long haul as our sea of red ink gets deeper and deeper.

PAGE 1 of 1

206:1 Comment noted. Please also see responses to comments 2:31 and 30:2.

206:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6 and misconception 8.

206:3 Comment noted. Please also see responses to comments 2:6 and 21:5.

206:4 Comment noted. Simulators do exist, and they are in continual use at Camp Shelby. As with flight simulators, however, they cannot substitute for all hands-on experiences. Please also see response to comment 2:310.

206:5 Comment noted.

206:1

206:2

206:3

206:4

206:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Robbie Lindsey Troyka

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>Robbie Lindsey Troyka</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meeting	
Address: <u>39 Ferwood Dr.</u>		Hattiesburg, MS	
City: <u>Laurel</u>	State: <u>MS.</u>	Zip: <u>39440</u>	Date: <u>January 9, 1992</u>
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>1</u>	RESOURCE AREA: <u>Natural Resources</u>		
<u>I am opposed to the idea of expanded</u>			
<u>use of Delta National Forest lands for back</u>			
<u>man resources because there seems to be little need</u>			
<u>for it any more. Mostly the damage to the</u>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
<u>environment causes my opposition. It seems</u>			
<u>to me that the people are being lied to and</u>			
<u>manipulated by our political and military leaders.</u>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		

207:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6.
207:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:3.

207:1

207:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Jo Tuepken

2/24/92

Mr. M. Mann

I am very much opposed to
expanded tank training in the
Red State National Forest. Common
sense tells me that with the
recent reduction in the military
and halted production on the
M-1 tank such an expansion
is wasteful & foolish. Perhaps
my view is rather simplistic,
but hopefully we can get
back to more simple things
like appreciation of natural
beauty. Thank you -

Sincerely,

Mr. Jo Tuepken
#7 Boyz alive
Long Beach, CA -
39520

208:1 See response to comment 21:7 and misconception 8.

208:2 Comment noted.

208:1

208:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Inez Tynes

209:1 Comment noted.

209:2 Comment noted.

Feb. 19, 1992
Morgan, Mrs. 39111
R.R. 1, Box 151

Mobile District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Attention: Mr. Thibodeau

Dear Mr. Cravens
The enclosing clippings
from Jackson Clarion-Ledger,
Feb. 19 edition, letters to Editor

think of all the money
that would be spent on this
project, when this Country is
in such financial "trouble!"

What more can I say,
that is not stated in Fierce's
letters.

Please give this your ut-
most attention.

Sincerely,
Inez Tynes (Mrs. M.A.)

Letters to the Editor (Clarion-Ledger,
2/19/92) attached to this letter
not reproduced in this FEIS.

MRS V. H. VALERINE
10447 SHORECREST ROAD
BILOXI, MS 39532

27 Feb 92

Sir:

I am opposed to the
expansion of taub training
in our forest for the
following reasons:

Damage to the eco-
system, Jim an animal,
bird, plant & tree
enthusiast. The noise
would be horrendous.

The quality of life for
those near by would
be diminished. Our
military need should
be reduced per all
releases from the
Pentagon. God Bless

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Virginia Valerine

210:1 Comment noted. See response to comment 21:3.

210:2 See response to comments 21:4 and 21:6.

210:3 See response to comment 2:6.

210:4 Comment noted.

210:1

210:2

210:3

210:4

210:4

not create forests
overnight.
Please make your
decision: NO!!

Sincerely,
Virginia H. Valerine

MRS. V. H. VALERINE
10447 SHORECREST ROAD
BILLOXI, MS 39532

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
David Varnado

Feb. 19, 1992
315 West St. Suite
McComb, Ms, 39648

Dear Mr. Cramer,

I must write in opposition
to the proposed use of DeSoto
National Forest lands as a
suitable area for tank training.

I do not feel that the
militaries has demonstrated an
overriding need for this land,
particularly as the Cold War
windo down to a halt. I
am also concerned about the

visit destruction of forest lands
as well as the negative effect
such a training ground would
have on those people living
nearby. Would you like to
live right next door to a
tank training area? I must

211:1 Comment noted.

211:2 Comment noted. See response to comment 2:6 and misconception 8.

211:3 See response to comment 21:6, 21:2, and misconception 9.

211:1

211:2

211:3

211:3

Assuredly would not! I urge
you to use your influence
to derail this plan, even in
the face of enormous pressure
from the military to do
otherwise.

211:4

Yours truly,
David Vamstad

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Charles Venus, Jr.

Feb. 28, 1992

Holy Rosary Catholic Church
900 Dabbs St.
Hattiesburg, MS 39401

Mobile District
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers CESAM-PD-EI
attn.: Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am sending this letter in support of "alternative #3B" and in opposition to "alternative #1" of the Environmental Impact Statement concerning the Camp Shelby land expansion.

As a minister and a social worker, I am aware of the ease with which human nature can allow huge interest groups (like the National Guard, Forest Service, etc.) to "have their way" just because of their momentum. I do not think that the case for the environmental impact extremes of "alternative #1" has been sufficiently justified by those who are arguing the case for the military.

Mississippi should not so irresolutely abandon one of its very few remaining, truly typical natural areas on the "hunch" that this will solve the (very likely organizational) problems of the National Guard. We can always change our minds later if the case becomes more credible! We can likely never regain the Leaf River WMA biological ambience!

Thanking you for your responsible consideration of all the "pros" and "cons" that must be coming your way, I am

Sincerely yours,

Charles C. Venus, Jr.

Rev. Charles C. Venus, Jr.
(pastor)

212:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 5 and 7.

212:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6. See general misconception statements 10 and 22.

212:3 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 3:12 and 74:2 and general misconception statements 11 and 14.

212:1

212:2

212:3

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Virginia Von Seutter

213:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 5 and 7.

February 16, 1992

Dear Sir:

This letter is to express opposition to the Camp Shelby
land expansion program. I am definitely opposing
alternative #1 and supporting alternative #3B.

213:1

Virginia von Seutter RN

Virginia von Seutter RN

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Cile Waite

214:1 See response to comment 14:1.

Dear Sirs;
Please change times for
public consideration of Shelby
IES to begin January 1.
We will appreciate your
not scheduling this during the
Christmas holidays.
Thank you
Cile Waite

10 DEC REC'D

214:1

401 South 36 Avenue
Hattiesburg, MS 39401
February 27, 1992

Mr. Tom Craven
Mobile District, Corps of Engineers
CESAM-PD-SI
P. O. Box 2233
Mobile, AL 36628

Dear Mr. Craven,

I have several questions that I request be addressed in the final EIS on the proposed tank training expansion at Camp Shelby.

1. What steps did you take to determine what caused the disappearance of the Red Cockaded Woodpeckers from Section 103 early in 1990 and what follow-up was done on their possible relocation? I observed 2 birds near their cavity tree in this area in January, 1990. When I later returned the road was impassable and I later learned they had disappeared. As guardians of endangered species you must have certain procedures that are undertaken in such cases, and I would like them explained.
2. Since the RC Woodpeckers were seen in Area 103 in 1990, why was this area omitted in references to the RC Woodpecker in the DEIS?
3. There are many landowners who would be affected by noise in the areas to be used for training in Alternative 1. Have you conducted interviews with these landowners to determine the extent of noise they presently endure? Will you document your procedures and instruments used to estimate the level and extent of possible future noise pollution?
4. A small amount of oil will pollute a large amount of water. I have read that 1 quart can pollute a 40 acre lake. There are many small streams and tributaries in the proposed use area which eventually empty into Black Creek and the Pascagoula. How will you determine how much oil leakage will occur with all those tanks in the area? How will it be contained? What will be done with used oil?
5. How many buildings will be constructed for tank maintenance and where will they be located? How many new access roads will be constructed to these buildings and where will they be located?
6. Since there is a moratorium on National Guard expansion and since the Army has said they will no longer use National Guard as combat support, what justification do you have for any expanded training?

Thank you for considering and answering these questions.

Sincerely yours,

Cile Waite
(Mrs.) Cile Waite

214:7 See response to comment 14:24.

214:2 The status of the RCW is given in Section 2.4.5.1 of the Final EIS. The RCW population shows a rate of decline similar to that of the rest of the De Soto National Forest, and no particular significance was placed on the existence of a colony at one time in compartment 103. The colony site is placed on the map in Figure 2-5.

214:3 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 21:4 and 176:18.

214:4 The Environmental Awareness Program at Camp Shelby is designed to inform soldiers of the environmental consequences of petroleum product spills. Prior to any training activity at Camp Shelby, units are briefed on the policies and procedures for spill prevention and further required by regulation to maintain and operate their equipment in a state of repair that prevents spills and leaks. Camp Shelby has in place a spill prevention, control, and counter-measures plan and an installation spill contingency plan in accordance with AR 200-1 and 40 CFR 112. These plans address actions required to prevent accidental release of petroleum products into the environment and address containment, counter-measures, and reporting procedures in the event of their accidental release. The Directorate of Facilities Engineering maintains the necessary equipment and personnel for spill containment and clean-up. Used oil generated at CSTS is picked up by a contractor for recycling. Please also see response to comment 20:5.

214:5 The fixed infrastructure is already in place at Camp Shelby, as are responsible pollution prevention programs. See Appendix C for the contents of the current Camp Shelby Environmental Regulations.

214:6 See response to comments 2:6 and 16:10.

214:8 Comment noted. The reference to 300 meters (984 feet) is in the evaluation section. A later note (Par A, pg L-1-6) identified that the "300" was a typographical error, and "100" was intended. Paragraph B (L-1-6) of the 1989 Opinion further identifies that a 200 foot buffer will apply around all colonies. This criterion has been utilized throughout the EIS study. Two more recent Biological Opinions (September 1992 and September 1993) have been issued which confirm the 200 foot buffer requirement.

214:9 See response to 214:8

214:10 See response to 214:8. The September 1992 Opinion was specifically sought by the National Guard as a part of the current proposals, and reiterates the 200 foot buffer requirement.

Will you comply with the FWS endangered species management plan recommended by Robert Bowker of FWS in Appendix I?

This plan calls for restriction of military training activities within 984 feet of gopher tortoise colonies. (I-1-5).

Mr. Bowker further states that an expected average of 25 acres per colony should be devoted to gopher tortoise management. (I-1-7)

This is a far more extensive management plan than the restriction of activities within only 200 feet of gopher or red cockaded woodpecker sites as mentioned in the EIS (3-95).

Please submit a statement that you will comply to the letter of the management plan submitted by Robert Bowker, or submit your own specific plan for public approval.

Thank you.

Cile Waite

Cile Waite,

Education Chairman,

Pine Woods Audubon

1- 9- 92-

*401 South 56th Ave,
Natchitoches, MS 39402
264-7925*

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Paul and Marie Walley

Feb. 29, 1992

Mr - Craven: as to whom it may concern:
I've read in the "Nothing American"
of the "study" whether to enlarge the tank
training of Camp Shelby. Our training of you
will consider it as - DON'T! DON'T!
Please don't cut out what this strictly is.
We live at Sub Kelly Green Co. our green
about a lot of noise from Camp
Shelby all year long, the planes, helicopters, the
jets, practicing holding, the guns going
24 hours a day. No sleep, except 10 mins and
sometimes that. BEEN BEEN BEEN BEEN
Truly, trust our army, no rest.
We've listened for 33 years, it's incoming from
any of it, just noise & pollution.
We're very far American - but look
what happened in the Gulf War?
MS. Not. Guard. What the hell are of the
power trained units called into active duty
with all the money spent and all those years
of practice, and noise, enough to enlarge
NO MORE - P/E A-5-E.
Paul G. and Marie Walley
P.O. Box 10544
Baton Rouge, MS 39476

If you can think of one good reason
will you please let us know? Thanks

215:1 Comment noted. See response to comments 2:79 and 2:80 and misconception 5.

215:2 Please see Sections 2.3.2, 3.1.5, 3.2.4, and 3.3.5 of the Final EIS. See response to comments 2:6 and 16:8 and misconception 8.

215:3 See response to comments 2:6, 21:4, and 21:6.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Gary Walters

Feb 24, 1992

To: The Honorable Trent Lott
cc: The Honorable Gene Taylor
cc: Mr Thomas Craven

Dear Gentlemen,

Here are some of my comments concerning
the Camp Shelby O.E.I.s.

As a member of the general public I
oppose the military using the Leaf River
Game Management Area for tank training.
I've spent most of my life living in and
around the Management Area and know first
hand of the difficulties and inconveniences the
military has caused the area residents. I'm
sure with the escalated training-planned, not
even the sportsmen and recreationalist that
visit the area can enjoy it without a
conflict with military training and environmental
changes. Military training is not what or
who the Leaf River Management Area was
designated for. If this were best all
recreation and game management areas would
include military operations.

While reading the E.I.s. it appeared
to me to be somewhat biased and not
accurate in its facts. Points that are

216:1 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 21:8 and misconceptions 4, 6,
10, 14, 22, and 23.

216:2 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 10:1.

216:3 Comment noted. The discussion in Section 3.5.9.2 of the Draft EIS referred to the decline in the number of pole-piling green mills and treating plants. Many smaller plants have been forced to close due to environmental requirements, consolidations by large companies, and increased competition for pole quality timber. Please see additional discussion of the timber industry's increased focus on the Southeast forests in Section 3.5.10.2 of the Final EIS.

216:4 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6 and misconception 8.

216:5 Please see response to comment 51:14.

positive to the military seem to be written as to highlight this and negative points seem to be written as briefly as possible. When speaking of the forest industry it states that there is a decline and will continue to be in the upcoming years.

As a member of the forest industry I do not agree with this statement. With the decline of the forest industry on the West Coast I've seen much more movement in this area in capital improvement and expansion.

One thing that disturbs me is that with the decline of aggression from the Soviet Union and its allies and the national debt being so high why we continue to use tax dollars to increase military training that may not be effective if conflict does break out.

If this plan does go through I'm concerned about my mother who owns 40 acres on the McLean road. It is completely surrounded by national forest land and a tank corridor is planned adjacent to her property. If the corridor is constructed it will devalue her property severely. I feel that she

as an individual will suffer financially.
Does the military have any plans to 216:5
guard against an individual's monetary
loss, when the loss is caused by their
unwanted actions?

Sincerely Yours,

Gary Walters

2054 Hwy 29

Brooklyn, NY 39425

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Everette Ward

217:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 22.

217:2 Comment noted. See response to comment 2.6. See general misconception statement 2.

EVERETTE L. WARD
2674 KEY ST.
JACKSON, MISS. 39212

MR. THOMAS M. CRAVEN
U. S. CORPS of ENGINEERS
MOBILE ALA.

DEAR SIR:

I am a veteran of WORLD WAR #2 and the KOREAN WAR also. I am a graduate of KEESLER FIELD airplane mechanic school and FORDIS B-24 factory school at WILLOW RUN, MICH. I was a 747&750 specialist on heavy bombers.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN had me recalled back for a period of one year in the KOREAN war as my specialty was needed. I feel that I have the right and privilege to express my views on preserving our national forests. I DO OBJECT to using them for tank training or for any use other than for recreation.

I feel we could close down CAMP SHELBY for good and put that money to a better use as CAMP SHELBY has out lived its use and time.

yours sincerely,

Everette L. Ward
EVERETTE L. WARD

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Arvid Watts

February 19, 1992

Thomas M. Craven
Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am writing you this letter to express my opposition to the expanded tank training in the Delta National Forest. The use of this land for any reason other than what it was intended will be detrimental to all living beings. In my opinion the thought of using this land for an expanded tank training area shows a lack of good judgment by all parties who wish to make this change. My opinion is based on the following facts from the FIS that was recently conducted. They are: loss of timber revenue from massive clear-cutting, damage to fragile ecosystems which involve protected animals and plants, noise pollution which has not been adequately studied, loss of forestry and forest-related jobs, diminished quality of life, especially for people who live near this proposed tank training, no established monitor or need, the recent reduction in the military and halted production on the M-1 tanks, and loss of recreational facilities to visitors across the country.

In closing, I say it would be to every one's best interest, including the politicians, to find a better solution to this problem.

Sincerely,
Arvid Watts

- 218:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 30:2.
218:2 See response to comment 21:2.
218:3 See response to comment 21:3.
218:4 See response to comment 21:4.
218:5 See response to comment 21:5.
218:6 See response to comment 21:6.
218:7 See response to comments 21:7 and 2:6.
218:8 See response to comment 21:8.

218:1

218:2

218:3

218:4

218:5

218:6

218:7

218:8

218:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Stephen Weems

219:1 Comment noted. Please also see responses to comments 2:6 and 21:7. Please also see general misconception statement number 11 and 22.

219:2 See response to comment 74:2 and misconception 12.

February 20, 1992

Mr. Thomas Craven
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, Ala. 36628-0001

Mr. Craven,

I, as a tax paying citizen and veteran of the U. S. Army and U. S. Navy of the United States of America, am appalled at even the suggestion of the National Guard obtaining thousands of acres of beautiful pristine forest land to be destroyed by weapons of war such as tanks that should be considered obsolete in modern warfare unless we are in Iraq or China. I see no established need to rape our land in this fashion.

I ask; Is the DeSoto National Forest to be in the interest of the National Security or to the greed and benefit of the politicians and top military brass to destroy our beautiful land and heritage?

I am truly outraged by this prospect. If the National Guard really sees a need for this type of practice, I suggest they send them to China or Iraq so they can get some real practice.

Indeed the National Guard is trying to steal the DeSoto National Forest from the American Citizens and should they be successful in doing so, they will have altered life as it was intended to be for our children.


Citizens to stop the land Steal,

Stephen L. Weems
Stephen L. Weems
Rt. 2 Box 1488
Lake, Mo. 39092

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
David Whatley

220:1 The Forest Service base map has been added as Figure 1-3 in the Final EIS.
Several additional references have been added to all figures in the EIS. Please also see
general misconception statement 5.

11-1-88
Draft E-15,
Mobile District
US Army Corps of Engineers
Attention CE SAM-PD-E/
Mr Thomas M. Craven,



We live in close
proximity to Camp Shelby
and would like a
map showing the
proposed land extension
to Camp Shelby

Sincerely,
David B. Whatley
165 Whatley Rd
Brooklyn, Ms 39425

SQUIBB
NOVO

393-004

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Patricia White

221:1 See response to comment 2:6, 2:31, and 53:4 and general misconception statements 5 and 12.

221:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:5.

221:3 Comment noted. Refer to response to comments 97:9 and 166:2 and section 3.3.4.3.1, County Returns, in the Final EIS.

221:4 Please see response to comments 10:5 and 14:46.

221:5 See response to comment 21:4.

221:6 Comment noted. Depending on the species, some will benefit and others will be adversely affected from the proposed action alternatives. Please see sections 3.3.2.4, 3.3.2.5, 3.5.5, and 3.5.6. These sections discuss the impacts to wildlife and T&E species from each alternative. Please also see response to comment 21:3.

221:7 Comment noted.

Route 2, Box 387
Heidelberg, MS 39439
February 25, 1992

Thomas M. Craven
CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven,

As a voter, citizen, tax-payer, resident of Mississippi and live within 50 miles of Hattiesburg, I feel that I should express my opinion on the DeSoto National Forest. I see no need to expand the tank training there for several reasons. If we are not going to have a full fledged military, why keep gaining more property to train the meager few we do have? I think this property should have the vote of the people before any true decisions are made. Before this ground is given to the military, I would like to know where the training was done in the years past? Has Camp Shelby not been sufficient?

I feel the DeSoto National Forest should remain as is, so that we the people, can continue to get the benefits of the rewards it has to offer. The timber sales can give jobs to logging workers; the school children can get a better education if the money gained from timber sales is applied to the use of the schools; the massive weight of the tanks will cause land washing away not to mention the noise pollution which would need to be studied; I am an avid animal lover of the animals that roam the forest and would not want to leave them homeless and without plants for food or nesting abilities.

All in all, I think this should be a project that the voice of the people can have an impact on instead of some of the elected officials taking it upon themselves to control in error. When I was informed in studying the jobs or positions of elected officials it was to be for the people, of the people and by the people. Now days it seems it is to leave the concerns of the people by the way side and our leaders take for granted they can make decisions without considering the people. I think we need to make our voices ring loud and long----give us back the decision as they stand for what the people want, not the officials wishes. SAVE THE DESOTO NATIONAL FOREST!!

Very truly yours,

Patricia A. White

PATRICIA H. WHITE

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
James Wilkinson

September 6, 1990

Dear Mr. (Mrs.) (Name),

I read the proposed Wildlife Plan for Camp Shelby and I'm still opposed to the swap. The noise level alone will affect the wildlife.

Also, this isn't going to keep the timberland from being destroyed. Timber is a major South Mississippi industry. Camp Shelby, as it is now, makes South Perry County a less desirable place to live.

I don't believe you Congressmen fully understand the ecological effect of all this. What about the people living in the land swap area? You are getting too much input from Forrest County realtors, Camp Shelby employees, and Hattiesburg businessmen - all of whom stand to gain. All the rest of us lose.

Believe me, Camp Shelby is big enough!

Sincerely,

James M. Wilkinson
James M. Wilkinson
P.O. Box 65
New Augusta, MS 39462-0065

P.S. The Desert would be a more appropriate place.

222:1 Comment noted. Please see Section 3.1.5.4 of the Final EIS and general misconception statements 5 and 12.

222:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:2.

222:3 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:6. See general misconception statements 12 and 25.

222:4 Comment noted.

222:5 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 16.

222:1

222:2

222:3

222:4

222:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
C.T. Williams et al.

223:1 Comment noted.

223:2 Comment noted.

223:3 Please note that the area will remain under Forest Service administration and not military control. See response to comment 3:12, 26:4, 28:3, and 150:1 and general misconception statement 9.

223:4 See response to comments 2:6 and 2:31.

26 February 1992
Lanark, MS. 39440

Thomas M. Cawen,
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2258
Mobile, AL. 36628-0001

Dear Sir -

This comes to ~~protect~~ extended tank training in the De Soto National Forest. This beautiful area belongs to the people and provides funds for our schools and roads, natural beauty and resources as well as recreational facilities for thousands of visitors every year.

If tank training is extended in the De Soto National Forest, the best of the people's land will be demolished. If the military gains control, there is no way the people will ever get this forest land back.

Could the military not do this

223:1

223:2

223:3

223:4

223:5 See response to comments 21:2 and 21:3.

223:6 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 3:12 and misconception 9.

223:7 Comment noted.

223:4
ferke training in other areas rather than our National Forest?

223:5
- As you well know there would be a tremendous loss of precious from massive timber cutting which would also leave the animals and plants that live and grow in this forest without any protection.

223:6
There are many more reasons for not destroying this forest and we ask you to please reconsider before taking action to do so.

Thank you for your help in this important matter.

Sincerely,
Ethel S. Williams
(Mrs. E. S.)

223:7
P.S. Enclosed you will find a few names of other people who feel the same way.

Louis W. Lammie

Charles H. Connor

James E. Connor

Martha Charvillat
Kenneth M. Caskey
Martha McQueen

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Donald Williams

Dear Mr. Thomas M. Craven
I am against tanks entering parts
of the National Forest South FS # 303
and forest wildlife management area.
I live south of the proposed area
on Janice Boudry Rd and have put
up with all kinds of noise pollution,
from heavy artillery and tankers planes
day and night and a fire point, ^{about 1/2 mile from my house}
I am against ^{this} ~~the~~ military museum has
been established nor has the military
established that they could not do.
This tank training in other areas,
also the recent reduction in
the military and halted production
of the M1 tanks.
also the loss of recreational
facilities to visitors and the added
erosion to our creeks, rivers and streams.

Yours Truly,
Donald Williams

- 224:1 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 19.
224:2 Comment noted.
224:3 See responses to comments 2:6 and 21:7.
224:4 See response to comment 2:31.
224:5 See response to comment 21:8.
224:6 Please see response to comments 10:5 and 14:46.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Brenda Williamson

Brenda Williamson
Post Office Box 614
Hattiesburg, MS 39403-0614

February 22, 1992

Mr. Thomas M. Craven
Mobile District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers CESAM-PD-EI
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Re: MY OPPOSITION TO ALTERNATIVE 1 OF THE DRAFT EIS AND MY
SUPPORT FOR ALTERNATIVE 6

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am writing to express my opposition to the expansion of tank training in the DeSoto National Forest. I am vehemently opposed to Alternative 1, which is an unconscionable effort to destroy irreplaceable endangered flora and fauna. I support Alternative 6, stopping all tank training at Camp Shelby.

The National Guard and G.V. "Sonny" Montgomery's efforts to ride roughshod over the rights of the public and the property owners and destroy the DeSoto National Forest show a *reckless disregard* for human life itself and the quality thereof.

If the National Guard is allowed to expand tank training, the quality of life for those who live in the area will be diminished by noise pollution, by destruction of the environment, and by military vehicular traffic. And who will want to visit such an area? Mississippi's Dept. of Tourism may as well close their doors if this land steal is allowed. What type of pesticides will be used in the tank training areas? Will they be experimental, the effects unknown? The U.S. military used soldiers as "guinea pigs" just last year by injecting them with experimental vaccines. If that is what they do to humans, what type of care will they take with delicate ecosystems? Rare plants and endangered species cannot talk to the public or vote!

I urge you to ask many, many questions before making your final decisions and don't accept statements that the National Guard issues as fact. On February 21st a National Guard spokesman said (via their uncritical mouthpiece, WDAM-TV) that you had already given the National Guard what they asked for. And I am sure that is not true, since you haven't received all input yet.

225:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 3:12, 10:1, 17:5, 26:2 and 74:2 and general misconception statements 5, 8, and 9.

225:2 Comment noted. See response to comments 21:6, 21:4, and 225:1.

225:3 Comment noted. Please also see misconceptions 5, 8, 9, and 12.

225:4 No use of pesticides is planned in the tracked vehicle maneuver areas. See response to comments 57:16 and 176:5. The active Army uses volunteers who have been trained in medical procedures for final trials of vaccines as they are developed, but no such usage is proposed at Camp Shelby.

225:5 Comment noted. Please also see the responses to comments 1:3, 1:4, 1:12, 3:27, and 26:2 which concern T&E species.

225:6 Comment noted.

225:1

225:2

225:3

225:4

225:5

225:6

February 22, 1992

--Page Two--

I understand that the Miss. Bureau of Pollution Control has issued a report on the Explosive Ordnance Detachment, determining that Camp Shelby is a large quantity hazardous waste generator. *Why hasn't the old ammunition and other military waste products (ordnance) in the impact area been considered a hazardous waste? How many years has it been accumulating?*

225:7

Also, the Mississippi Army National Guard Camp Shelby Training Site currently has a \$1000.00 penalty levied against them by the Commission on Environmental Quality for *noncompliance with the State of Mississippi's hazardous waste management regulations*. The "penalty or a portion of the penalty [has been] held in abeyance pending compliance by a certain date." (Source: *Environmental News*, Dept. of Environmental Quality, Vol. 11, Number 4, February, 1992)

225:7

It is increasingly obvious that the National Guard should not be trusted; therefore, I hope you will select Alternative 6 of the Draft EIS, not allowing any further tank training at Camp Shelby. Thank you for your consideration. Your decision is very important to the future health and safety of all of us who live in South Mississippi. This two page letter hasn't space to accommodate the many, many reasons I advocate Alternative 6 of the Draft EIS. I hope you will make a decision that will allow future generations to enjoy the natural beauty and solitude of the DeSoto National Forest.

225:6

Sincerely,

Brenda Williamson
Brenda Williamson

/bpw

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
David Williamson

February 21, 1992

Mobile District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers CESAM-PD-EI
Attn: Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am writing you to express my opposition to the expansion of tank training in the DeSoto National Forest and especially to Alternative 1 of the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I prefer Alternative 6 which does not reissue the Special Use Permit for National Forest lands. If current land is inadequate, all tank training should be stopped at Camp Shelby.

My opposition is based in part on the massive destruction of flora and fauna in the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area, Mississippi's oldest and most prized, that would be caused by the required clear-cutting of some 14,000 acres and thinning of some 7,000 more. The loss of this land for public recreational use is sufficient reason to stop the expansion. However, the clear-cutting and the compacting of the soil by the tank treads will also cause permanent damage to the ecosystem. Erosion and run-off into the Black Creek will effectively ruin Mississippi's only designated Wild and Scenic stream and soil compaction from the tank treads will effectively prevent the reforestation of the land when the tanks are gone.

My opposition is also based on reports which indicate that there is no military need for the expansion of tank training, "pork-barrel politics" notwithstanding. For example, there is the current "down-sizing" of the military and the halting of production of the M1 tank. The GAO report also indicates that the Army has grave doubts about a future military role for reserve roundout units, such as Camp Shelby's 155th armored, due to a lack of basic leadership skills among the NCO's and the high level of unreadiness for combat due to various attitudinal and health problems. Importantly, none of these problems are associated with lack of space for tank training.

Again, I prefer Alternative 6 which does not reissue the Special Use Permit for National Forest lands.

Sincerely,



David Williamson
P.O. Box 614
Hattiesburg, MS 39403-0614

- 226:1 Comment noted. Please see misconceptions 5 and 8.
- 226:2 See response to comments 3:12 and 17:5 and misconceptions 10, 14, 17, and 23.
- 226:3 The areas involved are not pristine and have been clear-cut in the past. The compaction of the soil by tanks and the cutting of trees is not expected to cause permanent damage to the ecosystem. Soil compaction is discussed in Section 3.1.1.3 of the Final EIS. Please also see response to comments 74:2 and 21:3.
- 226:4 See response to comment 10:5 and 14:46.
- 226:5 See response to comment 226:3.
- 226:6 See response to comment 2:6 and 21:7.
- 226:7 See response to comments 2:6.

226:1

226:2

226:3

226:4

226:5

226:6

226:7

226:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Jerry Windham

227:1 See response to comment 30:2.

814 Ralph St.
Wiggins, MS. 39577
February 27, 1992

Thomas Craven
Army Corps of Engineers
Mobile District
CESAM-PD-EI
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile Alabama 36628-0001

Dear Mr. Thomas Craven

Enclosed are my comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Military Training Use of National Forest Lands Camp Shelby, Mississippi.

So that my stand is not unclear, I am convinced that use by the military of lands that are part of a proclaimed National Forest is not compatible with the mission of the National Forest System.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jerry W. Windham
Jerry W. Windham

227:1

COMMENT SHEET

Jerry W. Windham
814 Ralph Street
Wiggins, MS 39577

Camp Shelby Training Site
Special Use Permit
Draft EIS

COMMENT NO: 1

RESOURCE AREA: Economics

The EIS states that the regional economy/employment will not be affected by alternatives 1-4, long term or short term, however alternatives 5 and 6 will have a negative effect, both long term and short term.

My concern is that any long or short term economic gains to the community due to military use depends on continued funding. The continued economic value of the land used in forest management is dependent on continued demand for forest products and uses. As long as the basic resource, the soil, is protected forest management will be the more dependable source of economic gain into the very distant future.

227:2

COMMENT NO: 2

RESOURCE AREA: Soils

The EIS states that short term, natural resources may be negatively affected by implementation/construction of alternatives 1 through 3B, however, long term these effects will be mitigated...

The use of the area by tanks on a repeated and annual basis will alter the soil structure and thereby its productivity. This type of impact can not be mitigated by revegetation. This type of impact which is long term and severe should not be allowed on National Forest lands. I do not believe that "Integrated Training Area Management" procedures will mitigate the effects of yearly military maneuvers in a way in which the cumulative effects would be comparable to those from management of land for tree crops. The EIS does not give sufficient evidence to back this claim.

227:3

On page 3-126 the statement that "training activities should be scheduled, as and when possible, under dry or saturated soil moisture conditions." demonstrates the EIS team lacks the general knowledge of natural resource management to take scientific reports and make management decisions from them. The soil may not be compacted when saturated, but will most assuredly be severely impacted by deep rutting. This statement leads me to visualize a mud derby run by tanks, and on National Forest Land. Makes me shudder!!!

227:4

I don't feel that the use by the military will be compatible with long term productivity of the soil resource. The use by the military will reduce the productive capacity of lands

227:5

227:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 35:12.

227:3 Please see Section 3.5.2 of the Final EIS.

227:4 Comment noted. The writer had prepared the phrase in question while speaking in a theoretical context. A more complete version of the original thought should have said "Therefore, training activities should theoretically be scheduled...under dry or saturated soil moisture conditions. Since the latter is impractical from a military context, dry soil is preferable." The text has been revised in the Final EIS, and discussion of the supersaturated condition has been removed. Please see Sections 3.3.1.4, 3.3.1.5, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 3.4.5, 3.5.2 and 3.5.3 of the Final EIS.

227:5 Comment noted. Section 3.1.1.3.2 of the Final EIS discusses the natural decrease in soil compaction over time. Preparers believe that training areas may be restored to essentially normal productivity in no more than 20 years.

227:6 Please see additional coverage in Sections 3.3, 3.4, 3.5.4 and 3.5.10.2 of the Final EIS.

227:7 See response to comment 1:10.

227:8 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6. See general misconception statement 5, 8, and 9.

227:5 impacted to the point that if returned to forest use it would take hundreds of years to return to its natural productivity. This can be assessed by independent sampling of soil properties related to its capacity to support vegetative growth in the areas previously impacted by military use compared to areas undisturbed by the military. Simply comparing degree of soil cover is not enough.

COMMENT NO: 3 RESOURCE AREA: Timber

227:6 The long term "slightly negative" effects of Alternative 1, 2 and 3B should be addressed in terms of the cumulative effect of losses of national forest timber resource availability to the forest industries of south Mississippi along with all other demands which reduce timber availability such as threatened and endangered species, visual resource management, mitigation measures for game and non-game species of wildlife contained in the standards and guides in the Land Management Plan for the National Forests in Mississippi.

COMMENT NO: 4 RESOURCE AREA: Natural Resources

227:7 A major concern to many people familiar with the current status of longleaf pine in the south is the continued reduction of acreage of longleaf pine. Originally over 60,000,000 acres of longleaf pine forest occurred across the south. For various reasons now only 5,000,000 acres remain. The public lands, primarily National Forest lands, contain the major portion of this remaining longleaf pine acreage. I find the loss of 20,000 + acres of National Forest longleaf pine unacceptable based on these facts.

COMMENT NO: 5 RESOURCE AREA: Military Readiness

227:8 Given the current changes in the world and reduction in military threat to United States interests in the world, I feel this is the wrong time to be expanding military activities. A reduction would seem the more appropriate alternative. The decision on this proposal should be taken as an opportunity to cut back on military spending. The money could be sorely used for more productive matters.

228:1 See response to comment 14:1.

DEAR SIR:
PLEASE DELAY THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT REGARDING THE USE OF DESOTO NATIONAL
FOREST LANDS BY THE MISSISSIPPI NATIONAL GUARD. IT SHOULD
BEGIN JANUARY 1, 1992 INSTEAD OF NOVEMBER 29. DECEMBER
IS A PERIOD OF FAMILY AND CHURCH ACTIVITIES THAT WOULD
PREVENT MANY PEOPLE FROM THE OPPORTUNITY TO GIVE THIS
VERY IMPORTANT MATTER THEIR FULL ATTENTION.
WE HOPE YOU WILL AGREE TO THIS REQUEST!

228:1

SINCERELY,
DOUGLAS E. & ELIZABETH M. WOLFE
Douglas E. Wolfe Elizabeth M. Wolfe



5 FEB 1992 7 FEB 1992

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

February 5, 1992

Mr. Tom Craven
Mobile District of Corps of Engineering
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL

Dear Mr. Craven,

I would like to express my support for Alternative 4 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Military Training Use of National Forest Lands near Camp Shelby.

As a professor who teaches Environmental Ethics at the University of Southern Mississippi, I learn from my students the importance that they attribute to wildlife values. There is a significant shift in values in our society. The actions of the Corps of Engineers should reflect that shift - both for the benefit of the people and for the benefit of the Corps as they attempt to serve the people. Lack of sensitivity by the Corps to the changing values of the society will only result in a future diminished role for the Corps perceived to be out of step with people's values.

I am not a member of the Pine Woods Audubon Society, but I wish to endorse their position statement which I know has been sent to you. I have read it carefully and I support the 22 points made in the position paper.

Thank you for your consideration.

Forrest Wood, Jr.
Chair
Department of Philosophy and Religion

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Forrest Wood, Jr.

229:1 Comment noted. Please also refer to the response to comment 10:1.

229:2 Comment noted. The Audubon Society's comments you refer to are addressed in the responses to commentor 14.

229:1

229:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Donald Woodall

March 4, 1991

Mobile District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers CESAM-PD-EI
Attn: Thomas Craven
P. O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

Donald Woodall
P.O. Box 15853
Hattiesburg, MS 39402

Dear Mr. Craven:

I am writing in reference to the proposed expansion of tank maneuvers into additional areas of the Desoto National forest. Please find below several observations of that issue:

1. The clear cutting of 21,217 acres of our national forest is a sacrilege. When there are national "plant a tree" programs, arbor celebrations, and environmental quality issues are at their highest level ever, this simplistic and wasteful display is absurd. The loss of these trees will impact air quality in unchangeable ways, for South Mississippi for centuries.

2. The runoff created by such clear cutting would denude these acres of priceless topsoil and change the drainage characteristics of Black, Beaver Dam and other creeks in the area forever.

3. The Mississippi National Guard has proven itself to be inept, inadequate, and ineffective in preparing for the Gulf War. The renewed push to expand the training area in the face of uncertain federal plans for the use of that facility, based partly on our Guard's inability to do the job with which they are charged.

4. With the end of the cold war, continued levels of all military funding are very uncertain. Are we Mississippians to trade in a pristine and beautiful portion of our state to be destroyed and then used as a bargaining chip in a desperate attempt to attract the attention of a Pentagon already disenchanted with our state guard? If so, who will benefit? Not the average Mississippian.

On the heels of the Land Swap, that greatest of land use lies, this is another in the line of unscrupulous operations that sacrifice the environment for the short term gain of the few. Sir, what happened to honorable men who work in honorable ways? Where are the Christian men with respect for God's beautiful land and its people, not just for today and the short gain, but for generations?

I welcome the opportunity to provide you with further input and invite your reply.

Sincerely,



Donald E. Woodall

cc: Colonel Pete Denton

- 230:1 Comment noted. See response to comments 3:12, 17:5, 35:27 and 74:2.
230:2 See response to comments 10:5 and 14:46.
230:3 See response to comment 2:6 and misconception 8.
230:4 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:31 and general misconception statements 11 and 25.
230:5 Comment noted.

230:1

230:2

230:3

230:4

230:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Wilma Woodbridge

231:1 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 14:32 and 30:2 and general misconception statements 5, 8, 9, 17, and 22.

231:2 See response to comment 2:6 and 53:4.

231:3 Comment noted. See response to comment 2:31 and misconception 16.

327 Briarwood Drive
Jackson, MS 39206
Feb. 27, 1992

Dear Mr. Green:

I am writing you to strongly protest the expansion of Camp Shelby into the DeSoto National Forest for tank training. In the first place, we should not have tank training in a National Forest that is set aside for wildlife and the enjoyment of the people of this country. To allow tank training would absolutely and totally destroy this area of beauty. If we have to have tank training, which I seriously doubt since we are scaling back our military all over the world, then it should be better to some other training base which would not involve destroying our National Forest.

231:1

231:2

231:3

From what I understand of the environmental impact statement, the taking over of our forest land would also involve loss to the timber industry and forestry-related jobs, loss of funds for schools and roads, loss of recreational area to visitors, damage to the ecosystems of plants and animals and noise and dust pollution to be endured. In common sense, this training should be done elsewhere and the majority of people in Mississippi and neighboring states are opposed to tank training in DeSoto National Forest.

Yours truly,
 Wilma B. Goodbridge

- 231:4 See response to comments 21:2 and 21:5.
- 231:5 Comment noted. Refer to response to comment 97:9, 166:2, and 181:4 and Section 3.3.4.3.1, County Returns, in the Final EIS.
- 231:6 See response to comment 21:8.
- 231:7 See response to comment 21:3.
- 231:8 See response to comments 21:4 and 21:6.
- 231:9 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:31.

231:4
 231:5
 231:6
 231:7
 231:8
 231:9

2 - 21 - 92

232:1 See response to comments 2:6, 2:31, 3:12, 17:5, and 21:3 and misconception
16.

Dear Mr Craven

This is another protest against the
destruction of our B. & N. National Forest. It is
ridiculous to train an armed outfit in a
wooded area in the Dept of Agriculture during
the last war with Jap. Since their biggest
problem was navigating, or knowing where they were
in that wide open desert area, or knowing where
"friends" were, it seems that they should be
training in the biggest desert area they could
find. That's one of the reasons that we had so
many cancellations from "friendly fire". No matter
how much time they take just in training and
tearing up desert forest they would only be
dead meat if called on to fight in the woods.
As a combat infantry veteran of WWII I would
much rather fight a tank than than anywhere
else. They are too easy to ambush in such an
area. So why not train in the type terrain
in which they would be more useful instead of
causing so much damage to our environment?

Lamar Wray
RT 1 Box 13

N. Am. CHAEL-45 39247

232:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Elizabeth M. Anglin

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FIRMLY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992	
Name:	Elizabeth M. Anglin		
Address:	210 Hillendale Drive		
City:	Hattiesburg	State:	MS
	Zip:	39402	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	1	RESOURCE AREA:	Procedural Issues
Where are the requirements of the Memorandum of Understanding documented in DEIS?			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	2	RESOURCE AREA:	Procedural Issues
What is the National Forest Management Plan addressed in the DEIS?			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	3	RESOURCE AREA:	Procedural Issues
When are the mission goals + objectives of the MS Dept of Fisheries + Wildlife for the Leaf River Wildlife Management Area addressed in the DEIS?			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	4	RESOURCE AREA:	Procedural Issues
Will the military reimburse the counties for revenues they lose from the conversion of land use?			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	5	RESOURCE AREA:	General
Since, at this time in the history of the world, the idea of expanding facilities for tank training is a ludicrous overreaction, this whole streamlining effort can be nothing more than a complicated and powerful, political ploy.			

234:1 Please see Section 1.2.9 of the Final EIS, and the master agreement, which is reproduced in Appendix A of the Final EIS. See also response to comment 2:31.

234:2 See response to comments 28:3, 30:2, and 176:2.

234:3 See Section 2.4.6 of the Final EIS and response to comment 176:3.

234:4 Refer to response to comment 97:9, 166:2, and 181:4 and Section 3.3.4.3.1, County Returns, in the Final EIS.

234:5 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 2:6 and 53:4 and misconception 8.

234:1

234:2

234:3

234:4

234:5

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PREPARE FINALLY

Name: Elizabeth Anglin		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992	
Address: 240 Hillendale Drive			
City: Hattiesburg	State: MS	Zip: 39402	

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 6 RESOURCE AREA:

One of the purported benefits of the expansion is economic growth. Many of us feel that growth is no longer a fact to a good thing, especially if it comes at the expense of the environment.

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 7 RESOURCE AREA:

I would feel better about the intentions of my government in this matter if they had committed some of my tax money to enabling the opposition to this project to voice its objections at this forum. Walking

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:

into this room full of uniforms and government-paid spokes-people encourages the us-against-them feeling. The protection of our environment and of our resources and potential, is our problem,

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:

and our government and our military establishment has an obligation to help us see both sides of all the issues, not just theirs. But this forum/public comment meeting makes

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:

those of us with legitimate objections feel that the "other side" has more power + resources than we can overcome, and they are here to make us believe that the correctness of the decision they have made rather than to listen objectively to our opposition.

234:6 Comment noted. Please see misconceptions 3 and 25.

234:7 Comment noted. Perhaps the purpose of this meeting has been misunderstood by some members of the public. It was for the purpose of providing information to persons who asked questions, and for receiving comments and statements from those persons wishing to provide them. Preparers can assure you that the capability of "the opposition" to "voice its objections" has never been in doubt. Please also see response to comment 48.2.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Joe Spell

236:1 Comment noted. The history of the area is presented in Section 2.5.3 of the Final EIS.

236:2 Comment noted.

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

COMMENTS BY JOE SPELL

1905 Ridgeway Lane

Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39401

BY MR. SPELL:

You would be interested to know where the national forest came from. It was originally privately-owned land by small farmers and timber companies. Small farmers couldn't make a living on it, so it sold for its taxes and matured and became state property. Timber companies cut all the timber, deeded the minerals to a northern holding company, and let the state have the land back for its taxes. So the land was denuded, cut over when the federal government got it.

In the late twenties and thirties, the federal government started doing something with it, planting trees on it, reforesting it, even by 1940. The natives down there would burn it so range cattle could graze. It was still open range. And until Camp Shelby started in there and says, we're going to protect it, did the Forest Service ever accumulate anything. So now, the

236:1

236:2

236:3 Comment noted.

236:4 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 2:6, 21:7, and 53:4.

1 Army wants to use it, and I'm for it. They're
2 good neighbors. They are part of America.

236:2

3 In recent months, we've been led to
4 believe that the Russians have changed their
5 attitude in wars anymore. Gorbachev gave a little
6 slack and they took advantage of it and he
7 kidnapped him and ran him off, and they got about
8 two to three times the people the United States
9 have. They can't read and write. And Hitler was
10 right when he said, "I want to take the Russian
11 people and at least teach them to read and write
12 so they won't get run over by German automobiles."

236:3

13 The people in Russia basically are
14 good, but they don't know how to make decisions.
15 America is going to have to maintain a strong
16 military because anybody can go into Russia and
17 start leading them again and they'll follow them,
18 and we'll have an enemy again.

236:4

19 So we're gonna have to keep this
20 country strong, and the foot soldier is the one
21 that keeps this country strong. If it hadn't been
22 for the presence of our tanks in Iraq and Kuwait
23 -- those Iraqis bunch up, then our smart
24 missiles can destroy a bunch of them. But if we
25 didn't have tanks there, there would have been no

236:5 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 1:2.

236:6 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 1:4, 1:12, and 1:33.

1	way to accomplish that war the way they did.	236:4
2	Isn't that right? That's the way I see it.	
3	So, these people that are against the	
4	red-cockaded woodpeckers' nest being destroyed,	
5	they've never seen damage that those red	
6	cock-headed woodpeckers do. They expand and they	
7	won't attack anything but good big trees, the	
8	virgin trees that are alive. And they peck holes	236:5
9	in those trees and keep pecking holes in them and	
10	bugs keying coming until that tree dies, and then	
11	they go to another live tree. So, farmers, land	
12	owners, timber owners do not like the red-cockaded	
13	woodpecker. We're not for destroying them, but	
14	they can get them a tree close to the swamp where	
15	we not gonna cut it.	
16	What other point do they make? The	
17	gopher turtles, the gopher tortoise, those things	
18	are of no economic benefit. I'm not for them	
19	being destroyed, but don't destroy America to	
20	protect those things. There's no economic	236:6
21	benefit; they're just there.	
22	I have some land and have some gopher	
23	tortoise on it, and I protect them because kids	
24	love to play with them. And they're not any	
25	danger, so they'll be maintained regardless of	

This Page Intentionally Left Blank (Response 236:6 on Previous Page)

1 | whether the army expands or not. Thank you for | 236:6
2 | your time. |

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
John Baum, Jonathan Baum

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRINT FAMILY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings
Name: <u>Jonathan Baum</u>		Gulfport, MS
Address: <u>2224 Ellis Hamilton Rd</u>		January 8, 1992
City: <u>Pascagoula, MS</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	
Zip: <u>39581</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____		
<p>I am Against Any Option which in any way Charges the Land use or limits the use of Lost River (WMA). Because of the short term and long term I'm not on wildlife. I am Against changing the COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____</p> <p>A cross And number of days that the WMA can be use.</p>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____		
<p>I am Against the way the EIS was conducted Be the Army Corp of Engineers. This statement was to talk bias. The Independent Agency or Firm was Conducted to find in an EIS.</p>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____		
<p>I am Against the way the Corp of Engineers Derived the Public by calling this the Continued Use of Osage National Forest. The Issue is whether or not and be that much the Army Derogates Lost River.</p>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____		
<p>Wild Life Management Areas! I am Also Against Changing the Area or Number of Days that the WMA Can be used Because it will affect the Wetland is South Mississippi. in A Negative Manner. This will Also Have A Tremendous Negative Effect on the Economy.</p>		

237:1 Comment noted. Please also see the responses to comments 10:1 and 63:5.
 237:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 4:3, 16:2, 18:1, 20:9,
 21:8 and 102:5 and general misconception statements 5, 8, 10, 14, 17, 22, and 23.
 237:3 Comment noted. See response to comment 237:2.

237:3

237:1

237:2

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

21 John Baum
22 22724 Ellis Hamilton Road
23 Pascagoula, Mississippi 39581

24 I would also like to say that I'm against any option
25 that will in any way affect the changes of the Leaf River
26 Management Area. I want to see the management area stay
27 exactly like it is. I don't believe that there should be
28 any long-term or short-term impacts on this particular area.
29 I believe that it should be left as is.

30 I also feel like that this -- that the military here
31 has made a cover-up on providing the necessary information
32 by changing certain wording that confuses the public about
33 this meeting. I feel like the military use of the DeSoto
34 National Forest Lands concerning Camp Shelby is not the
35 issue. I think that they are trying to take the Leaf River
36 Management Area under their control, and I do not believe in
37 that.

38 And I also have been an advocate of military spending.
39 I support the military, but I am in no way supportive of
40 this action. And if it does go through, I will continue to
41 not no longer support any military spending. I feel the
42 same way, also. I opposed -- I voted for Trent Lott and
43 Senator Gene Taylor. I've expressed my opinions to them,
44 and I will no longer support them if they support the Camp
45 Shelby issue going through.

237:4 Comment noted. See response to comment 237:2.

237:5 Comment noted. Perhaps the purpose of this meeting has been misunderstood
by some members of the public. It was for the purpose of providing information to
persons who asked questions, and for receiving comments and statements from those
persons wishing to provide them. Please also see response to comments 28:3 and 48:2
and misconception 23.

237:6 Comment noted.

237:7 Comment noted.

237:4

237:5

237:6

237:7

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mitch Bosarge

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FINELY Name: <u>Mitch Bosarge</u> Address: <u>11508 Three Rivers Rd.</u> <u>Gulfport MS 39503</u> City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Gulfport, MS January 8, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 1	RESOURCE AREA:	
How long has the training been taking place in the present training area, and how has the wildlife been affected in that area? (no matter how apparently insubstantial)		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 2	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 3	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 4	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 5	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 6	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 7	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 8	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 9	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 10	RESOURCE AREA:	

238:1 Comment Noted. Please refer to Sections 1.1.1 and 1.1.3 of the Final EIS for a discussion of training history at Camp Shelby. Wildlife status is presented in Section 2.4, and the effects of present activities on wildlife are presented in Section 3.1.2 of the Final EIS.

238:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Fried Boudreaux

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PREPARE TO SIGN

Name: Fried Boudreaux

Address: 3192 OAK GROVE RD.

City: Hattiesburg, MS State: MS Zip: 39402

Camp Shelby Training Site
Special Use Permit
Draft EIS
Public Comment Meetings
Hattiesburg, MS
January 8, 1992

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: Recreation

I strongly support the use permit and its use by Camp Shelby for over 200 people from the surrounding counties and there is no doubt that the lack of approval for use of the land would have a negative impact on the economy of Hattiesburg.

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: Recreation

Most of the lands that Camp Shelby currently uses for training are available for hunting and the change to tank maneuver should not diminish the use hunting on the lands. The habitat will not suffer. Deer and other animals abundant at Camp Shelby.

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: Recreation

The National Guard is committed to protect this concept and the land will be taken care of.

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: Recreation

If the land use permit for the recreation is not approved, it will very definitely have a negative economic impact on that area because there will be the unit training will definitely diminish.

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: Recreation

If too are concerned about endangered species, however, it appears that the animals on the endangered species list at Camp Shelby are increasing and due to the location of the National Guard they will continue to thrive in.

239:1 Comment noted.

239:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 7:4, 7:17, and 7:24.

239:3 Comment noted. The requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinions will continue to be followed. Please also see response to comment 1:2.

239:4 Comment noted.

239:5 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 21:8 and 102:5.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Jamie Boyll

240:1 Refer to response to comments 97:9, 166:2, and 181:4 and section 3.3.4.3.1, County Returns.

240:2 The acreages of tank areas that will be returned to forest production for all alternatives are displayed in Section 3.3.2.3.1, Table 3-24.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FINELY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Name: <u>JAMIE BOYLL</u>			
Address: <u>P.O. Box 10006</u>			
City: <u>Jackson, MS</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39216</u>	
			Jackson, MS January 7, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 1	RESOURCE AREA: <u>Economics</u>		
How will the counties be affected by lost or gain in revenues from forestry practices when all the 3 B's and say other potential loss of income?			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 2	RESOURCE AREA:		
How much acreage will be returned to forest production from existing acreage in use and tank alternative 1.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Rex J. Brannan

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>Rex J. Brannan</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit
Address: <u>RT 3 BOX 146</u>		Draft EIS
City: <u>Quavis MS</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Public Comment Meetings
Zip: <u>39425</u>		Hattiesburg, MS
Date: <u>January 8, 1992</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>I</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>ECONOMICS</u>		
<u>ADDDERS WOULD TAKE AT LEAST</u>		
<u>12 MILLION IN SALARIES ALONE FROM</u>		
<u>CAMP SHELBY</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>IT</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>NATURAL RESOURCES</u>		
<u>ANYONE THAT WANTS TO CAN TOUR</u>		
<u>CAMP SHELBY AND THAT THE LAND</u>		
<u>THAT IS NOW USED IS IN BETTER CONDITION</u>		
<u>THAN ANY IN THIS AREA</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>III</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>MILITARY TRAINING</u>		
<u>THE GULF WAR SHOULD SHOW PEOPLE</u>		
<u>THE BENEFITS OF HAVING WELL TRAINED</u>		
<u>COMBAT READY FORCES</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>IV</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>RECREATION</u>		
<u>THE GAME AND WILD LIFE AREAS</u>		
<u>USED IS MORE POPULATED THAN ANYWHERE</u>		
<u>IN MISSISSIPPI</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>V</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>INTERESTED TO AREA ABOUT THEM</u>		
<u>THE ARMY TAKES BETTER CARE OF OUR</u>		
<u>LAND THAN ANY PRIVATE ENTERPRISE</u>		

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

242:1 Comment noted. Please also see the response to comment 2:6.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRINT FIRST Y		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Name: <u>Tom Brock</u>		Hattiesburg, MS	January 9, 1992
Address: <u>Po Box 1858</u>			
<u>Hattiesburg</u>	State: <u>MS</u>		
City:	Zip:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
<p><i>Comments: Saw Angus considered a lot more important of not having the training area. For good and bad, training area will take KSMH Bell and will be a great resource for the environment. The better with some a major impact for the whole area.</i></p>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
<p><i>The issue of Mississippi near the training area, the training area is excellent for at meeting, it's great land.</i></p>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF Ott Brockman

243:1 Comment noted. Please also see Sections 3.3.4 and 3.5.10 of the Final EIS.

243:2 Comment noted.

243:3 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 21:8.

243:4 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6.

243:5 Comment noted.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>OTT BROCKMAN</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Address: <u>1004 ESTELLE ST</u>		Hattiesburg, MS	
City: <u>HATTIESBURG MS</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39401</u>	Date: <u>January 9, 1992</u>
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>1</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>EDUCATION</u>			
<u>CAMP SHELBY 3 RAYBOLT FOR</u>			
<u>TRAIN EMPLOYEES IS VITAL</u>			
<u>TO OUR ECONOMIC GROWTH</u>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>2</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>RECREATION</u>			
<u>OPPORTUNITIES FOR RETIREMENT</u>			
<u>WILL NOT SUFFER BUT COULD</u>			
<u>BE ENHANCED + IMPROVED</u>			
<u>WITH THE EXPANSION.</u>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>3</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>MILITARY TRAINING</u>			
<u>THE RECENT BERT STORM ACTIVITY</u>			
<u>PROVED THAT CAMP SHELBY IS</u>			
<u>VITAL TO OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE</u>			
<u>AND HAS BEEN SINCE 1911</u>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>4</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>NATURAL RESOURCES</u>			
<u>THE STUDY PROVIDES ADEQUATE</u>			
<u>SAFE GUARD FOR THE WILDLIFE</u>			
<u>+ CONSERVATION METHODS AS HAS</u>			
<u>BEEN OBSERVED BY THE NATL SD FOR YRS</u>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>5</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>PROCEDURAL ISSUES</u>			
<u>THE STUDY HAS BEEN COMPREHENSIVE</u>			
<u>THOROUGH + DETAILED + PROFESSIONAL</u>			
<u>DONE WITH ADEQUATE INPUT FROM</u>			
<u>THE PUBLIC</u>			

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Stan Budraitis

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRINTED PROUDLY

Name: <u>Stan Budraitis</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Address: <u>16216 Big Ridge Rd</u>		Gulfport, MS	
City: <u>Ridgely MS</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39153</u>	January 8, 1992

COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
I support the National Guard's use of National Forest land for the following reasons.	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
1. Mississippi is continuously near the top of the Nations unemployment figures. The use of these lands will increase the full-time personnel working at Camp Shelby.	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
2. Added land will give troops an area to train in a more realistic training environment.	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
3. Camp Shelby's increased security will reduce the amount of poaching which occurs on National Forest lands, therefore increasing wild game for sportsmen during legal hunting seasons.	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
4. Added land will prevent units from leaving Camp Shelby for other training areas with a more realistic training environment. More troops at Camp Shelby means more money for Mississippi.	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
5. Camp Shelby plants enormous amounts of grass which provide food for all types of wild life.	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
John A. Burnam

245:1 Comment noted.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PREPARE FULLY

Name: <u>John A. Burnam</u> Address: <u>P.O. Box 485</u> City: <u>Hattiesburg</u> State: <u>MS</u> Zip: <u>39403</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
I strongly support the emergency response of Alternative 1. I am extremely impressed by the amount of research which has gone into this project and the comprehensive analysis which has been done.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Chester Burnham

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRINTS FIRST	
Name: <u>CHESTER BURNHAM</u>	Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings
Address: <u>#4 EASTBROOK</u>	Jackson, MS
City: <u>MC KENSON</u>	January 7, 1992
State: <u>MS</u>	
Zip: <u>39216</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>1</u>	RESOURCE AREA:
<u>Does not want to see more area used for tank</u>	
<u>maneuvering. Do not want to see more of 7 land impacted</u>	
<u>by tanks for other heavy equipment. Concerned that tanks</u>	
<u>will skin trees & will create vectors for southern pine beetle.</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
<u>Concerned with taking timber land out of production.</u>	
<u>Question the actual economic benefit to MS & the local</u>	
<u>settling area of the proposal. Feels much of the</u>	
<u>training could occur at Ft Hood on the 7th in California</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:

CESAH Form 1134-2 (One-Time)
Dec 91

Page _____ of _____

246:1 Comment noted. You are correct in being concerned that damaged pine timber might increase Southern Pine Beetle activity and cause extensive damage to pine stands in the area. The high speed movement of tanks in a forested environment will cause damage to standing timber. To prevent this damage the area where this type maneuver will take place is planned for clearing of pine timber. The thinned areas will be for stationary concealment and only minimal tree damage should occur. Thus none of the proposed actions should cause increased Southern Pine Beetle activity.

See the discussion in Sections 3.3.2.3 and 3.3.4 for the effects of the various alternatives on the forest industry. Please also see response to comment 2:31 and 2:1:2 and misconceptions 5, 8, 9, 16, and 25.

246:1

246:2 Comment noted. See response to comment 2:31. See general misconception statement 16.

246:3 See response to comment 2:6.

246:4 See response to comment 2:31.

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

COMMENTS BY CHESTER BURNHAM

Number 4 Eastbrooke

Jackson, Mississippi 39216

BY MR. BURNHAM:

Well, I just -- I think the tanks
ought to run in Arizona or somewhere else and not
run over our pine trees in Mississippi. And I
don't see why they need to take -- a tank will run
over and knock down a 50-year-old or 100-year-old
trees and mash the ground down where they won't
grow when they could do these maneuvers in an area
-- the government's got plenty of land over the
rest of the country where they can, without
jeopardizing our military capability or
effectiveness, they can, you know, use the land
that the government already has somewhere else
that it won't hurt. That's what I want to say.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

246:2

246:3

246:4

247:1 Comment noted.

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

COMMENTS BY AUSTIN FERRILL, JR.

Post Office Box 151

Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39403

BY MR. FERRILL:

Well, I would just like to register my
support for the use of the land for training for
Camp Shelby. I feel like that Camp Shelby is a
great thing for our area and it's a great thing
for our defense. I think it would be a real
disaster if we lost Camp Shelby. And that's about
all I have to say.

247:1

248:1 Comment noted. Alternatives 1, 2, 3A, 3B, and 4 are all anticipated to have no negative effect on the local economy. Please see Sections 3.5.4 and 3.5.10 of the Final EIS and response to comments 2:6, 7:4, 7:17, and 7:24 and misconceptions 3 and 25.

CESAM Form 1164-3 (One-Time)
Dec 91

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRECISELY

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS HARD	
Name: JESSE L. CAUDN P.E.	Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Gulfport, MS January 8, 1982
Address: 106 HEWES SQUARE PLAZA GULFPORT MS 39507	
City: State: Zip:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 1 RESOURCE AREA:	
THE FUTURE DEFENSE OF THE USA WILL BE BY RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD FORCES. I SUPPORT USING DESOTO NATIONAL FOREST FOR TRAINING THE MILITARY.	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:	

CESAM Form 1164-1 (One-Time)
Dec 91

John A. Canon P.E.

—

249:1 Comment noted.

249:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Preston M. Cochran

January 9, 1992

To Whom It May Concern:

I'm Preston M. Cochran, residing at 2538 Hwy 29, ten miles south of New Augusta, Ms. I'm a certified landowner with land joining the propose tank training area. I'm a veteran of World War II, a retired school teacher, and presently an active minister. I'm not a new comer to this area. I was born on the property I now live on in 1920. My property joins the propose land project on the west, and I'm the last landowner on the south-west. From my property for two miles north we find a small community surrounded by Government land. There are around 40 citizens and fourteen are retired. Other citizens are located in other areas of this project.

I'm in possession of Volume I and II of the Environmental Impact Statement conducted by the Department of the Army. Their detail study was well presented on most issues. In gleanning thru this study, I noted every specie was given ample consideration except one. The neglected area was the human specie living in and joining the propose area. This has been our concern since the beginning. It appears that every specie was contacted personally except the human specie. No business, military, or political personnel has contacted concern citizens. We hear what Col. Garland Boleware, Col. James Jones, Rep. Sonny Montgomery, Rep. Gene Taylor, and Mattiesburg businessmen have to say from their offices. It seems they have their interest at stake and not the interest of the concern citizens. Not one inch of this land is in Forrest County, but all in Perry County.

The concern citizens have endured from seasonal training, but our concern deepens with year around training. When there was a need in World War I and II, it was no problem to purchase additional land from owners, but this present study indicate no plans to purchase, but let

250:2

250:1 The purpose of preparing the Environmental Impact Statement is to bring to the decision makers all the concerns, biological, physical, social and economic, of the proposed action. Comments and questions from residents, such as those you and your neighbors are bringing to the process, are important considerations. The leadership of the Mississippi Army National Guard is always willing to discuss the concerns of the neighbors of Camp Shelby.

250:2 Comment noted. In response to numerous concerns such as those you express, additional emphasis has been placed, in the Final EIS, on Quality of Life concerns. Please see Sections 2.3.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.5, 3.2.4, 3.3.3, 3.3.5, and 3.4.11 of the Final EIS. See also response to comments 21:4 and 21:6.

250:3 See response to comment 250:2.

250:4 See response to comments 250:1 and 250:2.

250:5 There are no proposals to acquire private property under any alternative. Please also see response to comment 51:14.


concern citizens endure. From seasonal training we have endured noise pollution, travel problems, and road blocks that the advocates do not have. This is not saying anything concerning the destruction of our property and public land resulting from year around training.

As a landowner, I wish to present this Impact Study Committee four questions for your consideration and recommendations:

1. Is the Impact Study closed to extended problems before your presentation? 250:4
2. Would you consider an indepth study on human species living in and adjoining the propose area as you did for other species? 250:3
3. Are there any recommendations to purchase property for the concern citizens who wish to relocate? 250:5
4. Is there a possibility for the military and political leaders who are behind this project to meet privately with the concern citizens living in and adjoining this propose area, in case there is not an indepth study presented by this committee? 250:1

I feel most of the concern citizens are interested in the general welfare for our community and would welcome your interest.

Sincerely yours,


E. J. Cochran
2538 Hwy 29 So.
Brooklyn, Ms. 39425
Phone 598-2662

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Milam Cotten

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PREPARE FIRST		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992	
Name: MILAM COTTEN			
Address: 2106 1 st AVE			
City: HATTIESBURG State: MS Zip: 39401			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
BLACK CREEK	HIKING & CAMPING		
I support preservation of the resources of Black Creek area;			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
however, I am a strong supporter of the US military			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
and want the military forces of the USA to have the			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
opportunity to maintain the highest state of readiness			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
which includes the opportunity of responsibility for training			
Milam Cotten			

252:1

252:1 Comment noted.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRECISELY

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FAIRLY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Gulfport, MS January 8, 1992	
Name: <u>J. F. Counts</u>	City: <u>RFPT</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39503</u>
Address: <u>2064 Evans Rd</u>	COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
	<u>What is the cost of the</u>		
	<u>most recent study? Is the</u>		
	<u>expense in dollars? Is it all</u>		
	<u>in the P&W project or could be run?</u>		
	COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
	<u>As a forester (retired) I hate to see</u>		
	<u>60-70 years of taxpayer money, and donation</u>		
	<u>to the cause of a predator and "the greatest</u>		
	<u>good" to U.S. citizens go up in song and smoke</u>		
	COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
	COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
	COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	

CESA Form 1164-1 (One-Time)

Dec 91

Page _____ of _____

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Ross Dodds

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

21 Ross Dodds
22 505 Front Beach Drive
23 Ocean Springs, Mississippi, 39564

24 I'm Ross Dodds of Ocean Springs. I would like to take
25 the opportunity to enforce my opposition that's continued
26 for the last two years over, number one, the expansion of
27 military use of Camp Shelby and the continued use of Camp
28 Shelby in its entirety for military purposes from now on.
29 For the following reasons I feel that Camp Shelby should be
30 closed permanently and designated a national park full-
31 time: that those areas that have been destroyed over the
32 decades may be attempted to be recovered and added back to
33 the national heritage.

34 Some justification for this are, number one, the
35 deployability of armored personnel vehicles has been proven
36 time and time again to be unrealistic as a weapons system.
37 In Afghanistan, a twelve-year-old Mudajjan Afghani rebel can
38 put out a Russian tank with a hand-held military weapon. The
39 time that it took to deploy armored personnel -- armored
40 vehicles in Saudi Arabia took weeks and weeks and weeks, and
41 most of those systems were deployed from Europe. And I
42 don't think we'll have that luxury of time in the next
43 conflict to deploy weapon systems.

44 And it's patently obvious that aircraft and missile
45 systems were the decisive factor in Iraq. This, to me, is
46 nothing more than a political issue and a military

254:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 5.

254:2 Comment noted. Please see misconception 2.

254:3 Comment noted. Not all potential U.S. or U.N. conflicts require instant
deployment of all forces and equipment. Prepositioning of equipment assists in some
areas, and deployment of equipment assigned to units in the U.S. follows rapidly.
Recent experience has shown, however, that a combination of these two approaches
will provide an in-theater force in a time adequate for operational needs. The readiness
of the *personnel and units* is the issue being addressed, in part, by the present
proposed action. Please also see response to comment 53:4.

254:4 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 53:4.

254:1

254:2

254:3

254:4

254:5 Comment noted. Procedures have been implemented throughout the Department of Defense to ensure that proposals for additional training land are evaluated thoroughly. Preparers note that, even though overall military strength is being rapidly decreased, the mission demands of many remaining locations are being increased. A closed installation provides no training opportunity. See also response to comment 2:6 and general misconception statements 5 and 12.

254:6 Comment noted. See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31.

254:7 See response to comment 2:6.

254:8 Comment noted.

21 industrial complex issue. The acquisition of additional
22 land in the State of Mississippi in Camp Shelby is only part
23 of a 4.5 million acre land grab that's under way at this
24 time. At the present time, the military controls 25 million
25 acres of our land. I don't think they need anymore. And I
1 think quite frankly they can do with less.

2 And finally, there is no justification been established
3 that this land in Mississippi is necessary for added tank
4 maneuvers. It's redundant. It's a replication of services
5 which can be done quite well at other installations. And
6 finally, I must say that the National Guard in the Desert
7 Storm Conflict failed abominably. According to the general
8 accounting office study on the performance of the units
9 called "Service" 33 percent of the personnel were unfit for
10 dental reasons, 44 percent of the personnel were unfit for
11 medical reasons. They were totally lacking in
12 administrative skills, and they were totally ignorant of
13 maintenance schedules for tank turrets. They were found to
14 be totally lacking in their ability to maintain them
15 mechanically.

16 I think we're entering into an era of peace time, and I
17 think it's time we beat swords into plowshares. Thank you.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Sandra Dalrymple

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>Sandra Dalrymple</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Address: <u>160 Pine Grove</u>		Gulfport, MS	
City: <u>Blain</u>	State: <u>Ms.</u>	Zip: <u>39531</u>	January 8, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
I am totally and unequivocally opposed to ANY encroachment into our Federal Forest.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
I don't feel like adequate publicity has attended this national forest issue.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		

255:1 Comment noted.

255:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 51:15.

255:1

255:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Larry Joe Daughtry

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS HARD

Name: LARRY JOE DAUGHTRY

Address: 101 PINEWOOD DRIVE

City: HATTIESBURG, MS State: MS Zip: 39402

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	COMMENTS
256:1	ECONOMICS	I strongly support Camp Shelby and the expansion! The expansion and use modification will increase training activities, construction opportunities, supply support, professional services - all which will bring millions \$ to our area.
256:2	ENVIRONMENTAL	I encourage the proposed expansion to be approved! Camp Shelby, MSARNG, and Bureau have improved environmental personnel to assure compliance with federal & state regulations. No other industry has the environmental resources Camp Shelby has.
256:3	TIME	I support the expansion of Camp Shelby and use agreement modifications. Clear cutting & thinning will provide job opportunities and additional financial resources for local school systems. This is no more that what is currently done in other forests.
256:4	WILDLIFE	We need the area to allow adequate training area for track vehicle maneuver which will increase unit qualification, local and National Defense, and that of Camp Shelby.
256:5	WILDLIFE	Camp Shelby has done more in planning for wildlife conservation through erosion control than even the forestry service. Wildlife will be even more protected and preserved in the expansion area and will be better managed and controlled for hunting.

256:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 97:9 and 166:2 and general misconception statement 5.

256:2 Comment noted. Erosion control work on the Camp Shelby permit area is done in accordance with the Camp Shelby Erosion Control Plan. This plan includes the Forest Service erosion control guidelines for the De Soto National Forest and was approved by the Forest Service for use on National Forest lands.

The Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks has the statutory responsibility for managing game populations on National Forest lands in Mississippi. Any protection and management activities within the area covered by the permit would be conducted by them and not the National Guard. Also see general misconception statement 5.

256:3 Comment noted. Please see misconception 5.

256:4 Comment noted.

256:5 Comment noted. Please see misconceptions 3 and 25.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Joel Dougherty

14 FEB 1992
COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS HARD	
Name: <u>Joel Dougherty, Capt, USAF</u>	Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings
Address: <u>1614 Beach Blvd #51</u>	Gulfport, MS
City: <u>Biloxi</u> State: <u>MS</u> Zip: <u>39531</u>	January 8, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
<u>How can the 155th justify a 16,000 acre land acquisition of National Forest land in the midst of the vast military drawdown?</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
<u>With the conclusion of M-1 tank production why ask for more land than the Guard already needs.</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
<u>What exactly is the mission of the 155th?</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
<u>Our biggest threat will be desert conflict 1000-Series OPLAN's bar that out. The forest is not the place to train for desert warfare. Let's cut between the military need and the political maneuvering associated with this FASCO.</u>	

- 260:1 See response to comments 2:6 and 21:7. Also see general misconception statements 12 and 8 and Section 1.1.2.3 of the Final EIS.
- 260:2 Comment noted. See responses to comments 2:6, 35:12, and 176:36.
- 260:3 Comment noted. See response to comments 2:6 and 197:8 and Section 1.1.2.3 of the Final EIS. Please also see general misconception statement 12.
- 260:4 See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31.

260:2

260:1

260:4

260:3

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF Lynne Dougherty

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>LYNNE DOUGHERTY</u> Address: <u>11664 BEACH BVD, #51</u> City: <u>RILOXI</u> MS State: <u>39531</u> Zip: <u>435- MD60</u> Date: <u>January 8, 1992</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Gulfport, MS January 8, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>261:1</u>	RESOURCE AREA: <u>WHY DESTROY OUR LAND TO PROTECT OUR LAND??</u> <u>IT SEEMS ABSURD TO RUIN OUR OWN PRECIOUS</u> <u>DESOTO NATIONAL FOREST TO TRAIN TANKS. WE</u> <u>SHOULD HOLD THIS LAND SACRED AS WE DO OUR COUNTRY!</u>	261:1 See response to comments 2:31 and 30:2 and misconception 12.
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>261:2</u>	RESOURCE AREA: <u>IT SEEMS INSANELY CONTRADICTIONARY TO TAKE</u> <u>THIS FOREST LAND WHEN THERE IS OTHER</u> <u>LAND/AREAS OUT THERE THAT ARE NOT UTILIZED.</u> <u>THIS LAND IS BEING USED FOR THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH</u> <u>IT WAS SET ASIDE.</u>	261:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 10:1 and 51:15 and misconception 12.
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>261:3</u>	RESOURCE AREA: <u>TANK TRAINING IS NOT AS ESSENTIAL</u> <u>WITH OUR WORLD SITUATION TODAY AND NOT</u> <u>VITAL TO OUR NATION'S DEFENSE. THEREFORE,</u> <u>I TOTALLY OPPOSE THE STEAL OF THIS LAND.</u>	261:3 Comment noted. See responses to comments 2:6 and misconception 8.
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>261:4</u>	RESOURCE AREA: <u>CAMP SHELBY COULD BETTER UTILIZE THE</u> <u>LAND THEY ALREADY HAVE. IF THE DESOTO</u> <u>NATIONAL FOREST IS NOT HARMED IT WILL NOT</u> <u>HAVE TO BE FIXED. IT IS BEAUTIFUL!!</u>	261:4 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 10:1.
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>261:5</u>	RESOURCE AREA: <u>THE EIS REPORT IS HOGWASH! IT WAS DONE WRONGLY</u> <u>THIS LAND IS OUR LAND! BELIEVE IT AND</u> <u>HAVE A BETTER VISION. THIS VISION OF USING</u> <u>OUR PRECIOUS DESOTO FOREST IS VERY DISTORTED</u>	261:5 Comment noted.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

NAME: LYNNE DOUGHERTY
 ADDRESS: 1664 BEACH BLVD #51
 CITY: BILLOXI STATE: MS ZIP: 39531
 Camp Shelby Training Site
 Special Use Permit
 Draft EIS
 Public Comment Meetings
 Gulfport, MS
 January 8, 1992

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA:
 It seems as if the National Guard is
 Fighting their own people and Country.
 when, in fact, we should all be in
 unity for our Country.

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA:
 There is not one sane reason why
 this land should be taken and used
 so unwisely. There is plenty of other
 land to use. Why our previous ~~preserved~~ land.

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA:
 I worked for 2 Summers at
 Camp Shelby and I know where the
 Guardsman spent their money because
 I ran the cash register. They spent it on Beer.

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA:
 I oppose the land steal and how the
 whole ordeal has been handled. It
 was done very unethically from
 the start.

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA:
 I believe in our Country and want to
 Continue to do so. Stop the
 Land steal and give Faith back to the
 rest of us who also serve our Country.

261:7

261:10

261:6

261:2

261:5

261:11 Comment noted. See misconception 12.

261:12 Comment noted. See response to comment 30:2.

261:13 Comment noted. See response to comments 2:31 and 197:1 and misconceptions 9 and 17.

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of :

1	Lynne Dougherty	
2	1664 Beach Boulevard, Apartment 51	
	Biloxi, Mississippi 39531	
3	I haven't thought this through or anything so I'm just	
4	going to say what I feel. I totally oppose the steal of the	
5	DeSoto National Forest surrounding Camp Shelby. I think it	261:11
6	is contradictory to take land that has been utilized for	.
7	forestry, the trees, the people, the animals and be used to	
8	train with tanks when in fact it is our land and the	261:12
9	military is to protect our land. It seems wrong to destroy	
10	our land when in fact the military is to protect. And this	
11	land is utilized, and there is land that is not utilized	
12	probably with bases closing. Those lands could be utilized	261:13
13	in perhaps an alternate plan; but, otherwise, I feel the	
14	land steal is ludicrous.	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
James Fairly

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PREPARE TO SIGN		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992	
Name: <u>James Fairly</u>			
Address: <u>P.O. Box 96</u>			
City: <u>Deale</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39465</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
	<u>Wishes to this Nation has become scarce, I</u>		
	<u>don't think we as Mississippians should add</u>		
	<u>to the problems.</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
	<u>I think a human being needs a home near to</u>		
	<u>that a bird.</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
	<u>Camp Shelby does a fine job with the</u>		
	<u>space of the land when used</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		

263:1 Comment noted.

263:2 Comment noted.

263:3 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 25.

263:3

263:2

263:1

264:1 Comment noted.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FIRMLY		DATE OF VISIT	PAGE	OF
Name: <u>BILL FERRELL</u>	Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings		Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992	
Address: <u>601 So 19th Ave</u>	City: <u>HATTIESBURG</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39401</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____		RESOURCE AREA: <u>GENERAL</u>		
<p><u>IT APPEARS TO ME THIS ISSUE HAS BEEN THOROUGHLY RESEARCHED AND PLANNED. I CAN SEE NO REASON WHY ALTERNATIVE 1 SHOULD NOT BE APPROVED - THE TRAINING CAN BE CONDUCTED WITH MINIMAL LONG TERM EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT- FROM WHAT I SEE, THERE COULD ACTUALLY BE AN IMPROVEMENT OF RESOURCES THROUGH THE CUTTING & PROPER MANAGEMENT OF THE LANDS</u></p>				
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____		RESOURCE AREA: _____		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____		RESOURCE AREA: _____		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____		RESOURCE AREA: _____		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____		RESOURCE AREA: _____		

CESAM Form 1164-3 (One-Time)
 Dec 91

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Jean Ford

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRINT FIRMLY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Name: <u>Jean Ford</u>			
Address: <u>5464 W. 4th St</u>			
City: <u>Hattiesburg</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39402</u>	
			Gulfport, MS January 8, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
I support Camp Shelby and the proposed Alternative #1 to increase tank training because it provides employment in this area that impacts many different industries, such as the hotel/motel industry.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
I am assured that the area affected by the extended tank training will be refurbished to a level that is acceptable to both the National Forestry Service and the U.S. Military.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		

265:1 Comment noted.

265:2 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 25.

265:2

265:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
C.D. Galey

267:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 5 and 25.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FINELY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 8, 1992	
Name: C.D. GALEY	Address: 20500 751	City: Hattiesburg, MS	State: MS Zip: 39403-0091
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
I fear Camp Shelby expansion as proposed. The economic benefit upon our community is vital and we are confident that environmental concerns will be addressed in a responsible manner. <u>STRONGLY FAVOR.</u>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Jess Hughes

271:1 Comment noted. Refer to Misconception 25.

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

COMMENTS BY JESS HUGHES

Post Office Box 763

Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39403-0763

BY MR. HUGHES:

The economy of this state will suffer heavily, particularly the tourism in the state, if there is any reduction in the training at Camp Shelby, Mississippi. This is not limited just to the counties surrounding Camp Shelby. The tourism industry on the Coast and all way through the state will be seriously hampered. The university -- wait a minute -- with the university there and Camp Shelby, there were, last month -- last year there were 37 states represented by military personnel at one of those two places. And they come from all over the United States, some from Puerto Rico, some from Washington, D.C., some from Michigan. The training out there is a pull to the tourism industry and to the economic development of the state of Mississippi, not limited to south Mississippi.

271:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Michael D. Gilpin

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>Michael D. Gilpin</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Address: <u>517 Eatonville Rd</u>		Hattiesburg, MS	
City: <u>Hattiesburg</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39403</u>	January 9, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	Military Training Reg.	
Alternative #1 is the most desirable option and should be implemented. It is an option favorable for all interested parties.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	Regional Economy	
The region has long been dependent upon military training. The military has been a good provider with the community and both ways co-exist without conflict.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	Recreation	
The long term contribution to recreation will be positive. This community currently enjoys water recreation and excellent hunting due to previous military involvement.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	Natural Resources	
This area has not been abused by either military training. I realize that the "creeper" mentality will prevail with environmentally conscious leadership.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	Timber Industry	
As a land owner and tree farmer I support the managed cutting of timber. I have found that good management increases yields. The plan is acceptable and should be implemented as Alternative #1.			

CESAM Form 1164-3 (One-Time)
Dec 91

Page _____ of _____

272:1 Comment noted.

272:2 Comment noted.

272:3 Comment noted. Please also see the response to comment 21:8.

272:4 Comment noted.

272:5 Comment noted.

272:1

272:2

272:3

272:4

272:5

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Olivia Graves

274:1 Comment noted. See response to comment 2:31 and general misconception statement 5, 8, and 16.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FIRMLY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Name:	Olivia Graves	City:	Gulfport, MS
Address:	21568 Gantman Rd	State:	MS
	Saucier	Zip:	39574
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
	I do not find any expansion of the former permit acceptable. Therefore I favor 4 or 5. Perhaps the National Guard should swap tank training and		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
	Emphasize supply services in Mississippi. Other areas of the United States are more suitable for tank training.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		

275:1 Comment noted. Please see misconceptions 5 and 12.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PREPARE FULLY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992
Name: JOHN K. GRAY	City: HATTIESBURG Ms.	
Address: 506 REBECCA AVE	State: MS	
	Zip: 39401	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
CAMP SHELBY LAND SWAP — ECONOMIC		
I SUPPORT THE CAMP SHELBY LAND SWAP PROVIDED		
LAND OF EQUAL AREA AND/OR VALUE BE PROVIDED		
WITHIN THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI UNDER THE		
STATE CONSTITUTION ^{FEDERAL GOVERNMENT}		
ADMINISTRATION OF THE U.S. FORESTARY SVC.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Jeanette S. Hall

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRINT FULLY Name: <u>S. F. Jeanette S. Hall</u> Address: <u>1127 Easternville Road</u> <u>Hattiesburg</u> MS <u>39401</u> City: State: Zip:		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
I feel Mississippi the surrounding area Hattiesburg and all area near Camp Shelby will be hurt if the land is not acquired		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
Please Please help get all that is needed people in the future will be sorry some day if not sooner		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	

276:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 5 and 12.

276:1

277:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 5.

CESAM Form 1164-3 (One-Time)
Dec 91

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Terry Herrington

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRINT FULLY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings
Name: <u>Terry Herrington</u>		
Address: <u>Box 1973</u>		
City: <u>Hattiesburg</u> State: <u>MS</u> Zip: <u>39403</u>	Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
I support Camp Shelby's request to use this area to maintain and expand the economic impact it has on the area.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
The land will maintain and greatly improve the area for hunting and recreational use.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
The land will maintain adequate protection for all wildlife and endangered species with respect to additional land ground in the cleared area.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	

278:1 Comment noted. See misconceptions 5 and 25.

278:2 Comment noted.

278:3 Comment noted.

278:1

278:2

278:3

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT	
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRINT FULLY	
<p>Name: <u>WILLIAM S. HOWELL</u></p> <p>Address: <u>P.O. Box 667</u></p> <p><u>PAULUS</u></p> <p>City: _____ MS <u>39475</u></p> <p>State: _____ Zip: _____</p>	<p>Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992</p>
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
I ask no reason why the special use permit to use National Forest land should not be granted to the Mr. National Guard, if it will help him address the emergency training for this state and country. The money in the area is decreased because it's kept the employees at Camp Shelby employed. It's kept the troops here so they are coming to Camp Shelby and keep the money from entering the economy too. I don't add more funds to the unemployment & welfare bags.	
Support Camp Shelby for the good of Mississippi!	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:

281:1 Comment noted.

533

Curtis B. James

282:1 Access via foot-traffic through some areas is expected to improve as underbrush is cleared and the reduction in overstory improves hunter vision. While these modifications to the habitat will not clearly not benefit some species (quite detrimental to some), many of the game species frequently cited as having greatly expanded their populations in North America since the arrival of European man. Their tolerance for disturbance and human activity has enabled them to thrive in many agricultural and urban areas, areas in which forest fragmentation is frequently excessive. The edge-associated cottontail rabbit may be subject to vehicular mortality with improved access, but it is unlikely that this would exceed its reproductive potential. Thus, the projected benefit to hunters was based on the creation and maintenance of new edge habitat, and improved hunter access.

282:1

282-2.3 The category "recreation" includes many elements of which camping is only one. It is acknowledged that camping during the summer annual training period may be adversely affected in some areas as opposed to the present. Preparers note that all developed camping areas on the Black Creek District are outside the Special Use Permit area.

182:3

[illegible]

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

<p>PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FIRMLY</p> <p>Name: <u>Curtis B. James</u></p> <p>Address: <u>400 Clay St, Room 235</u></p> <p>City: <u>Vicksburg</u> State: <u>MS</u> Zip: <u>39180</u></p>		<p>Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings</p> <p>Jackson, MS January 7, 1992</p>
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>282:2 Why is there no discussion of compensation for the net loss of 10,408 acres of forest land (clearing or thinning) for Alternative 1?</p>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>282:4 Why is there no discussion of compensation for the loss of 53 acres of wetlands for Alternative 1? (The nation's goal is no net loss of wetlands)</p>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>282:5 Why is Forest Fragmentation stated as not a problem since leaving islands of forest is forest fragmentation?</p>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>282:6 Biodiversity would not be positively impacted with Alt 1. Biodiversity is maintenance of native flora and fauna which would not occur with clearing and thinning of 24000 acres.</p>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	

282:2 Please see response to comment 3:24.

282:4 Several proposed mitigations are proposed in the Final EIS. See response to comment 3:16.

282:5 Fragmentation was mentioned as a problem in the DEIS (page 3-81, first para.), but has received a great deal more coverage in the biodiversity sections created for the FEIS. See sections 2.4.7, 3.1.2.6, 3.3.2.6, and 3.5.7. See also response to comments 1:9 and 1:11.

282:6 See the response to comment 282:5.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Don Johnson

283:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 3, 5, and 25.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FIRMLY

Name: Don Johnson

Address: 14 Williamsburg

City: Petal State: MS Zip: 39465

Camp Shelby Training Site
Special Use Permit
Draft EIS
Public Comment Meetings
Hattiesburg, MS
January 9, 1992

COMMENT/QUESTION NO.: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____

The economic impact on Forrest County will be offset by the revenue if Camp Shelby ~~there~~ is not granted the license that is proposed. There will not be any reason for other states to train in

COMMENT/QUESTION NO.: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____

Do the (Camp Shelby) These out-of-state contracts bring in enough revenue of money and every business in Forrest County will feel the effect. It would definitely create a ripple effect in the

COMMENT/QUESTION NO.: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____

economy
I Forrest County wants Camp Shelby, Camp Shelby needs the additional land.

COMMENT/QUESTION NO.: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____

COMMENT/QUESTION NO.: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS HARDY

Name: Doris C Kauss My USAF Ret

Address: 1542 Collins St.

City: Albany MS State: 39530 Zip:

Camp Shelby Training Site
Special Use Permit
Draft EIS
Public Comment Meetings

Gulfport, MS
January 8, 1992

286:1 Comment noted.

COMMENT/QUESTION NO.	RESOURCE AREA:
12. See! Jan 4 9:10 I saw 1 large Shilly from the air on a flight into Bullhead - I was amazed at the amount of large birds in the air. I did see get a Bristle Shilly face together - one joined the flock.	RESOURCE AREA:
COMMENT/QUESTION NO.	RESOURCE AREA:

COMMITTEE QUESTION NO. _____ RESOURCE AREA _____
should be adequate. I would opt for
alternative 4, as additional clear cutting
is flimsy

[illegible][illegible]

COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:

287:1 Comment noted.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FULLY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992
Name: <u>Penny Vaccaro</u>	City: <u>Hattiesburg, MS</u>	
Address: <u>273 Ralph Rader Rd.</u>	State: <u>MS</u> Zip: <u>39402</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA: <u>Wildlife</u>	<p><i>I was concerned about the discrepancy in number of other tortoise active permits reported however, Mike almost assured me that the latest count by Dr. Usher did include the correct number (nearly appreciated)</i></p>
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	

Page _____ of _____
 CESAM Form 1164-3 (One-Time)
 Dec. 91

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Allen D. Lantz

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>Allen D. Lantz</u> Address: <u>104 St. Augustine Dr</u> <u>Long Beach</u> <u>MS.</u> <u>39560</u> City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Gulfport, MS January 8, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>1</u> RESOURCE AREA: _____ COMMENTS: <u>CONCERN ABOUT THE INCREASE IN TRUCK TRAFFIC, WITH THE</u> <u>BASE CAMP OF THE SOUTHERN UNION WAY OUT WE HAVE TRAFFIC TRUCKS</u> <u>@ CAMP SHELBY</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>2</u> RESOURCE AREA: _____ COMMENTS: <u>WHY DO WE NEED THIS MUCH LAND CLEAR CUT FOR TRUCK TRAFFIC @ SHELBY</u> <u>UNLESS THERE IS TRAINING IN CA AND IT THAT HAS BEEN CLEAR CUT</u> <u>FIELDS AROUND</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>3</u> RESOURCE AREA: _____ COMMENTS: <u>CONCERN WITH WETLAND DEGRADATION, SITUATION OF CREEKS, AND THE</u> <u>PROBLEM OF ASSURING THE PUBLIC THAT WE WILL CHANCE OUR</u> <u>PRESERVE ACTIONS TO ASSURE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IT</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>4</u> RESOURCE AREA: _____ COMMENTS: <u>CONCERN: LOSS OF WILDLIFE HABITAT, LOSS OF WILDLIFE, LOSS OF</u> <u>RECREATIONAL USE OF THE AREA. I USE THIS AREA FOR</u> <u>HIKING, CAMPING, HUNTING & FISHING. WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO</u> <u>ENDANGERED SPECIES?</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>5</u> RESOURCE AREA: _____ COMMENTS: <u>CONCERN: Deforestation, we have spread federal and private</u> <u>land to combat loss of rainforests and to replant trees</u> <u>because of increased car and global warming. To cut</u> <u>THIS AREA IS CONTRARY TO THIS EFFORT.</u>		

Responses 288:1, 6, and 3 on Following Page.

288:2 See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31. See general misconception statement 16.

288:4 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 35:27.

288:5 Please see the responses to comments 1:3, 1:4, 1:25, 3:27, and 26:2 which concern Threatened and Endangered species and the proposed actions. See response to comments 21:3 and 102:5. The impacts to wildlife (sections 3.1.2, 3.3.2.4, 3.5.5, and 3.5.6) and recreation (3.1.3.4, 3.3.3.4, and 3.5.11) have been re-assessed based on the proposed actions as stated in the Final EIS.

288:7 See response to comments 7:4, 7:14, and 7:24.

288:8 See response to comment 2:6 and misconception 8.

288:8

288:2

288:7

288:5

288:4

288:6 Please see Section 3.3.2.3 and 3.4.9 and the response to comment 21:2.

238:1 Comment noted. Please see misconception 7.

288:3 Comment noted. See Sections 3.3.4.1 and 3.5.10.1 of the Final EIS, which show the effects on the economy of all alternatives.

NAME: <u>Allen D. Lantz</u> ADDRESS: <u>144 St Augustine Dr.</u> CITY: <u>Long Beach</u> STATE: <u>CA</u> ZIP: <u>90801</u>		CAMP SIBOLY TRICHTING SITE SPECIAL USE PERMIT DRAFT EIS PUBLIC COMMENT MEETING GULFPORT, MS JANUARY 8, 1992	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>5</u> RESOURCE AREA:		<u>Q: To cut this large volume of timber will flood the market and put small timber companies out of business.</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>6</u> RESOURCE AREA:		<u>A: In my opinion, after reading the EIS, the only alternative acceptable is 3b.</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>7</u> RESOURCE AREA:		<u>Escalante Import: There will be little or no increase in the economy if this use is granted. The loss of tank training at Camp 5 holes, will not seriously affect the economy.</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:		COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:		COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
William R. Lindsley, Jr.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>William R. Lindsley Jr.</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Address: <u>6040 Old Hwy 42</u>		Hattiesburg, MS	
City: <u>Hattiesburg</u>		State: <u>MS</u>	
Zip: <u>39401</u>		January 9, 1992	

COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
289:3	I strongly support alternative #1 because it best meets the community's needs and does not have the maximum impact on the environment. This will also guarantee more employment at Camp Shelby and a higher standard of living for the local economy. The price of fuel for new cars is cheap and money well. Only by being prepared
289:2	Can we best preserve the environment in a better way - but as we were after WWT and WWTII. If this can only way help prevent the Americans from being to be used in a hostile environment it would be a total support for money concerned citizens.
289:1	

- 289:1 Comment noted.
- 289:2 Comment noted. Please also see misconceptions 3 and 25.
- 289:3 Comment noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Gary Loper

- 290:1 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 17.
290:2 Comment noted.
290:3 Comment noted. See response to comment 102:5.
290:4 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6.
290:5 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 5.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: Gary Loper		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Address: 2613 Bullis Avenue		Gulfport, MS	
City: Gulfport, Miss.	State: MS	Zip: 39501	Date: January 8, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:			
ECONOMICS - I AM ECONOMICALLY AGAINST THIS ISSUE BECAUSE I DON'T FEEL THE NEED TO SPEND TAX DOLLARS THAT COULD GO TO MORE WORTHWHILE PURPOSES.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:			
NATURAL RESOURCES - I AM AGAINST THIS ISSUE BECAUSE I HAVE SEEN FIRSTHAND THE DESTRUCTION THE TANK TRAINING BEARS.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:			
RECREATION: I AM AGAINST THIS ISSUE BECAUSE I DON'T FEEL AS A TAXPAYING CITIZEN THAT I WOULD BE GRANTED THE USE OF THE LAND THAT I HAVE NOW.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:			
MILITARY TRAINING: ALTHOUGH I AM A PROponent OF A SOUND AND WELL-TRAINED MILITARY FORCE, I DON'T FEEL THE U.S. ARMY NEEDS ANY MORE LAND TO TRAIN ON.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: RESOURCE AREA:			
GENERALLY AS A U.S. CITIZEN, AND MORE IMPORTANTLY REGARDING THIS ISSUE, AS A NATIVE SOUTH MISSISSIPPIAN, I AM VEHEMENTLY OPPOSED TO THE ADDITION OF LANDS FOR TANK TRAINING.			

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Robert L. Loper

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PREPARE FINELY

Name: Robert L. Loper

Address: 1310 35th St

City: Gulfport, Ms State: Ms Zip: 39501

City: Gulfport, MS State: January 8, 1992

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____

ECONOMICS - opposed due to winding down

of all MILITARY expenditures. Destruction

caused to forest is UNRECOVERABLE - Construction

of further impact studies AT TAYLOR - NO

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____

Gen. Topics - No specific Remarks

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____

Recreation - would be restricted and

detrimental over long period - Very

Harmful

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____

Procedural Issues - Rough sketch attempt

to override all Environmental considerations

and against wishes of many citizens

COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____

NATURAL RESOURCES - extremely harmful

to all vegetable, animal, terrain features.

MIL. TRAINING - unnecessary because of military

negativity

291:1 Comment noted. See response to comment 2:6.

291:2 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 35:12 and misconceptions 8 and 17.

291:3 See response to comment 21:3.

291:4 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 10:2 and 51:15.

291:5 Comment Noted. Please refer to response to comments 16:2, 102:5, and 282:3.

291:2

291:5

291:4

291:3

291:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Ann Lyon

293:1 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 25.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>Ann Lyon</u> Address: <u>3317 W 4th St #103</u> City: <u>H'burg</u> State: <u>Mo</u> Zip: <u>39401</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
I support the use of the land for the better training of our Nation's defense.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
I support the use of the land because it will increase the economies of scale for Perry + Forrest Counties		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
I support the EIS for its thorough work in the use of the land.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Joseph Lyon

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>Joseph Lyon</u> Address: <u>3317 W. 4th St. #103</u> <u>Hattiesburg</u> MS <u>39401</u> City: State: Zip:		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
As a citizen of the United States, I support the use of the land because the economics of the situation warrant such action. I to this city and surrounding communities & Greater for the whole		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
As a member of the MSARNG, I support the use of the land for the training of Battalion sized elements. Its important to talk at the platoon size but in case it is proved that you will fight in Battalion size		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
I personally feel that the people & staff which have worked many long & hard hours on the EIS have done an excellent job in carrying all areas of the proposal.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	

294:1 Comment noted.

294:2 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 25.

294:2

294:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Robert D. Mason

295:1 If the commentator is referring to the combustion products of the propellant powder, the composition of these gases has been examined many times by both Army research laboratories and the EPA. No significant adverse air quality effects are known, to result from this firing. Preparers note that no change in the number or type of weapons usage is proposed.

295:2 See response to comments 10:5, 14:46, and 35:6.

295:3 See response to comments 2:20, 2:339, 20:5, and 133:2.

295:4 No new activities other than maneuver are proposed. The areas involved have been used by the National Guard for decades for all types of activities other than off-road tracked vehicle maneuver. These other uses are expected to continue.

295:5 The Black Creek Scenic River does not lie between the proposed maneuver areas and the impact area. In any case no firing is proposed from other than defined firing points at or near the impact area. See general misconception statement 13 and 15.

295:6 See general misconception statement 12.

295:7 Comment noted.

295:8 Please see response to comments 35:31 and 104:1.

295:9 The gas turbine produces fewer nitrogen oxides and particulates than the diesel engines in the M60 tank.

295:10 Comment noted. Starting after training year 1993, Mississippi guardsmen and women will also be paid at their home of record. Preparers do not see this change as a factor affecting any environmental analysis, since economic benefit has not been claimed as basis for selecting Alternative 1 over the other action alternatives. See also response to comment 133:12 and misconceptions 3 and 25.

295:11 Comment noted. The noise characteristics of the Abrams are somewhat different than those of the M60 series, and Army Environmental Hygiene Agency studies show that it is quieter than the M60 in road travel.

295:12 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 20.

Robert D. Mason

P.O. Box 61

Brooklyn, MS

601-545-9410

cd \daze

Questions

1. What will be the effect of all the discharge of the guns getting into the ecosystem.

2. The laser range finder will adversely affect the sight of humans it follows that it would possibly blind animals of the forest.

3. The Abrams is an extremely loud vehicle, will the noise pollution have an adverse effect on the wildlife.

4. The maneuvering of tanks during dry periods kicks up large clouds of dust, how will this dust effect the animals and the rest of the ecosystem.

5. The Abrams is an extremely thirsty vehicle. Have the effects of a major refueling accident been taken into account. Also what is the danger to the public of a major fuel tanker truck accident in route to the training area.

6. What will be the effect of the NOx emissions and particulate emissions of the Abrams turbine engine.

7. There is no doubt that the Abrams will severely damage the topsoil and possible the subsoil in the area, will the added silt added to the Black Creek watershed harm it in any way.

8. Does the army intend to fire the Abrams back at the impact area if so projectiles flying over the Black Creek Scenic area would be totally unacceptable.

9. Camp Shelby is already the largest guard base in the U.S. where would they move them that would be larger.

10. Camp Shelby already can use the area in question under the Forest Service special use permit why is it necessary for the DOD to take title.

11. What other activities are planned for the area other than tank training and have there effects on the environment been studied.

12. ~~Other~~ states like TX, AL, LA do not pay their training guardsmen until they return home. Taking this into account is the loss of the area for hunting & fishing worth it.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
L.A. McGinnis

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRINT FULLY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 8, 1992	
Name: <u>L.A. McGinnis</u>	Address: <u>2303 McInnis St.</u>	City: <u>Hattiesburg</u>	State: <u>MS</u> Zip: <u>39402</u>
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
<u>Why do you need this extra land?</u>			
<u>If you have the water, etc. then the land is once again available</u>			
<u>I personally, how can it be more advantageous either way?</u>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

Thomas A. McLain

298:1 Comment noted. See response to comments 28:3 and 30:2 and misconceptions 22 and 23.

298:2 Comment noted. Please see the response to comments 26:2 and 288:5.

298:3 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 7:4, 7:17, and 7:24.

298:4 Tracked vehicle activity on other military installations has been shown to have a negative impact on some species while benefiting others. See Sections 3.1.2.4 and 3.3.2.4 through 3.3.2.6, 3.5.5, and 3.5.7 for a more in-depth discussion of the effects of tank maneuvering on wildlife. Please also see response to comment 21:3.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: Thomas A. McLain
 Address: 13016 SHELBY DR
 City: GULFPORT MS 39503
 State: MS Zip: 39503
 Date: January 8, 1992

COMMENT/QUESTION NO.	RESOURCE AREA	DATE
1	1. RMA	1/8/92
2	2. RMA	1/8/92
3	3. RMA	1/8/92
4	4. RMA	1/8/92
5	5. RMA	1/8/92
6	6. RMA	1/8/92
7	7. RMA	1/8/92
8	8. RMA	1/8/92
9	9. RMA	1/8/92
10	10. RMA	1/8/92
11	11. RMA	1/8/92
12	12. RMA	1/8/92
13	13. RMA	1/8/92
14	14. RMA	1/8/92
15	15. RMA	1/8/92
16	16. RMA	1/8/92
17	17. RMA	1/8/92
18	18. RMA	1/8/92
19	19. RMA	1/8/92
20	20. RMA	1/8/92
21	21. RMA	1/8/92
22	22. RMA	1/8/92
23	23. RMA	1/8/92
24	24. RMA	1/8/92
25	25. RMA	1/8/92
26	26. RMA	1/8/92
27	27. RMA	1/8/92
28	28. RMA	1/8/92
29	29. RMA	1/8/92
30	30. RMA	1/8/92
31	31. RMA	1/8/92
32	32. RMA	1/8/92
33	33. RMA	1/8/92
34	34. RMA	1/8/92
35	35. RMA	1/8/92
36	36. RMA	1/8/92
37	37. RMA	1/8/92
38	38. RMA	1/8/92
39	39. RMA	1/8/92
40	40. RMA	1/8/92
41	41. RMA	1/8/92
42	42. RMA	1/8/92
43	43. RMA	1/8/92
44	44. RMA	1/8/92
45	45. RMA	1/8/92
46	46. RMA	1/8/92
47	47. RMA	1/8/92
48	48. RMA	1/8/92
49	49. RMA	1/8/92
50	50. RMA	1/8/92
51	51. RMA	1/8/92
52	52. RMA	1/8/92
53	53. RMA	1/8/92
54	54. RMA	1/8/92
55	55. RMA	1/8/92
56	56. RMA	1/8/92
57	57. RMA	1/8/92
58	58. RMA	1/8/92
59	59. RMA	1/8/92
60	60. RMA	1/8/92
61	61. RMA	1/8/92
62	62. RMA	1/8/92
63	63. RMA	1/8/92
64	64. RMA	1/8/92
65	65. RMA	1/8/92
66	66. RMA	1/8/92
67	67. RMA	1/8/92
68	68. RMA	1/8/92
69	69. RMA	1/8/92
70	70. RMA	1/8/92
71	71. RMA	1/8/92
72	72. RMA	1/8/92
73	73. RMA	1/8/92
74	74. RMA	1/8/92
75	75. RMA	1/8/92
76	76. RMA	1/8/92
77	77. RMA	1/8/92
78	78. RMA	1/8/92
79	79. RMA	1/8/92
80	80. RMA	1/8/92
81	81. RMA	1/8/92
82	82. RMA	1/8/92
83	83. RMA	1/8/92
84	84. RMA	1/8/92
85	85. RMA	1/8/92
86	86. RMA	1/8/92
87	87. RMA	1/8/92
88	88. RMA	1/8/92
89	89. RMA	1/8/92
90	90. RMA	1/8/92
91	91. RMA	1/8/92
92	92. RMA	1/8/92
93	93. RMA	1/8/92
94	94. RMA	1/8/92
95	95. RMA	1/8/92
96	96. RMA	1/8/92
97	97. RMA	1/8/92
98	98. RMA	1/8/92
99	99. RMA	1/8/92
100	100. RMA	1/8/92

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PREPARE FAMILY

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND FURNISH FULLY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992	
Name: Mrs. G. F. MIXON JR	Address: 13 MIXON DR	City: NEW AUBUSTA MS	State: MS Zip: 39462
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:		RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>I'm for use of Forest Area for Camp Shelby, we have no age reg for husband & I will leave the match carry of Congress & they were very cooperative. I'm now growing pine trees at new location of Marine on Highway 98.</p>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:		RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>Camp Shelby is very cooperative in putting spring trees & the public will probably be able to maintain some of new territory. I travel via Hwy 29 we stop about 1/2 mile before in Vegetation and then</p>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:		RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>take crossing times are often 1/2 hr by I also I wish for enough so the tank does cross later in the day. I can travel by high way 49 when necessary.</p>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:		RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:		RESOURCE AREA:	

CESAM Form 1164-3 (One-Time)
Dec 91

Page _____ of _____

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Donnie F. Myers, Jr.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

<p>PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PREPARE</p> <p>Name: <u>DONNIE F. MYERS JR</u></p> <p>Address: <u>347 SHERBO LOOP</u></p> <p>City: <u>RETNL</u> State: <u>MS</u> Zip: <u>39465</u></p>		<p>Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings</p> <p>Hattiesburg, MS January 8, 1992</p>
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>1</u>	RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>I SUBMIT THE LAND NOW FOR CAMP SHERBO. I THINK IT GOOD FOR THE STATE, & IT'S CITIZENS. I BELIEVE THERE WILL STILL BE ROOM FOR WOODS, WATERS, AND OUTSIDE THE STATE.</p>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>2</u>	RESOURCE AREA:	
<p>THE ASSUMPTION WILL BE GOOD FOR THE ECONOMY LOCATED OUTSIDE THE STATE.</p>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	

300:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 5, 12, and 25.

300:2 Comment noted. Please see response to comment 300:1.

300:2

300:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Eric B. Nye

301:1 See response to comment 2:6 and misconceptions 5 and 8.

D-13 ~~Start~~ 2/3/92

Eric B. Nye
73711 Diamondhead Dr. N.
Bay St. Louis, MS 39520
(601) 255-5912

Mobile District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
CESAM-PD-EI
Attn: Mr. Thomas M. Craven
P.O. Box 2288
Mobile, AL 36628-0001

27 January 1992


Dear Mr. Craven,

Please send me a copy of the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed expansion of the maneuver areas in the Desoto National Forest.

I am opposed to further expansion of the maneuver areas, but I would also like to know the reasons the Mississippi National Guard feels the expansion is necessary, especially in an era of dramatically reduced tensions with the former USSR.

If you have any literature on the reasons for the proposed expansion, would you please send that along with the draft EIS. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,


Eric B. Nye

301:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Stewart Odom

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>Stewart Odom</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Address: <u>810 N. 31st Ave.</u>		Hattiesburg, MS	
City: <u>Hattiesburg</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39401</u>	Date: <u>January 9, 1992</u>
COMMENT QUESTION NO: <u>(1)</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>Economics</u>			
Our tax dollars can be much better used here in the state of Mississippi than they are here, having talent from all over the nation to convince us that the proposed plans are in our best interests. Our best interests, in transportation, education, social programs, etc., can be much more immediately served, many times over, with the funds expended here.			
COMMENT QUESTION NO: <u>(2)</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>NATURAL RESOURCES, PROCEDURAL ISSUES</u>			
To call the proposed clearing of 14,000 acres an act of "no significant environmental impact" (Re: Alternative 1) to say nothing of timing and attendant noise disruption, is sort of silly. The impact cannot be thus ignored, but should be evaluated honestly against other factors.			
COMMENT QUESTION NO: <u>(3)</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>PROCEDURAL ISSUES</u>			
The monopoly which government agencies hold over the drafting of the EIS is disillusioning. Although it certainly wouldn't make the research and drafting any more headache-free, I believe a more well-rounded report could be written at a far less cost.			
COMMENT QUESTION NO: <u>(4)</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>PROCEDURAL ISSUES</u>			
These arrays of co-ordinators, Environmental special interest groups, lumber industry experts and others being present could provide valuable insight on how to enhance the depth and accuracy of the study.			

302:1 Comment noted. The wording of the statement partially quoted is more properly rendered as *no significant, irreversible, long term impact when compared to present activity levels.*

302:2 Comment noted. See response to comment 10:1.

302:3 Comment noted. See response to comment 63:5.

302:2

302:1

302:3

[illegible]

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Louis F. Pace

303:1 Comment noted. Please also see misconceptions 3 and 25.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>LOUIS F. PACE</u> Address: <u>116 LAMAN AVE</u> <u>HATTIESBURG, MS 39401</u> City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Jackson, MS January 7, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
The EIS should be approved. And the use permit extended in order to provide for continued growth at Camp Shelby. The revenue generated from the Camp Shelby operation has a tremendous economic impact on Hattiesburg and the surrounding areas. Shelby has proved to be the great stabilizer for Hattiesburg.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
During the summer when enrollment is at its lowest point at USM and within Camp Shelby, the influx of Reserve troops to Camp Shelby and USM makes it possible for businesses to continue normal operations and helps keep the tax base up.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____ COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____ COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____ COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____		

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FIRMLY

[illegible]

CESAM Form 1164-2 (One-Time)
Dec 91

Page _____ of _____

305:1 See responses to comments 2:6 and 2:31.

305:2 See response to comment 53:4.

305:2

305:1

306:1 Comment noted.

[illegible]

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
J.B. Simonton

307:1 Comment noted. See also misconception 5.

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

COMMENTS BY J. B. SIMONTON

230 Briarhill Cove

Florence, Mississippi 39073

BY MR. SIMONTON:

I was opposed to the expansion of the
training area of Camp Shelby when the idea was
proposed two years ago. I wrote my Congressman
and my senators at that time and told them I was
opposed. I'm still opposed. I think it's -- I
don't think it's beneficial to the state of
Mississippi or to its people. I think it's a
waste of taxpayers' money, and I intend to do
everything that I can to see that it's stopped.

307:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Frank Polk

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND FULLY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings
Name: FRANK A. POLK		
Address: P.O. Box 1150		
City: HATTIESBURG MS	State: MS	Zip: 39403
City: Hattiesburg, MS	January 9, 1992	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO.	RESOURCE AREA:	
I AM CONCERNED THAT THE ABILITY OF PRIVATELY HELD SMALL SCATTERED PARCELS OF SEPARATED MINERAL OWNERSHIP (SEPARATE FROM SURFACE OWNERSHIP) TO EXERCISE RIGHTS OF ACCESS HAS NOT BEEN ADDRESSSED IN EIS. THAT IS, I DON'T SEE WHERE THE EFFECT THAT CONSTRUCTION OF MAINTENANCE AREAS WOULD HAVE ON BELIEF MINERAL OWNERSHIP HAS PRIMACY OVER SURFACE OWNERSHIP.		
I AM ALSO CONCERNED THAT LEASES ARE MADE WITH SURFACE OWNERS FOR USE BUT NO LEASES ARE MADE WITH THOSE HAVING MINERAL OWNERSHIP UNDER THESE LANDS. FOR EXAMPLE WHERE HAVE WE MADE LEASES PRIVATE TRACTS FOR USE -- LEASES ONLY WITH THOSE HOLDING SURFACE RIGHTS -- NO COMPENSATION IS MADE TO THOSE HAVING MINERAL OWNERSHIP.		

CESAH Form 1164-3 (One-Time)
Dec 91

Page 1 of 1

308:1 Comment noted. See added coverage in FEIS in Section 2.6.2, 3.1.4.2, and 3.3.4.2 and response to comments 3:5 and 63:17. Your question is seen as an issue between the owners of the surface and subsurface rights.

308:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Joan Rains

309:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 5 and 25.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT		PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRINT FULLY	
Name: <u>JOAN RAINS</u>	Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 8, 1992		
Address: <u>53 Ralston Rd</u>	City: <u>Hattiesburg</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39401</u>
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
<i>I would like to see Camp Shelby expanded.</i>			
<i>The environment I believe would be protected</i>			
<i>as well as possible. Hattiesburg county</i>			
<i>could benefit economically from this expansion</i>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF

C.E. Rawls

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>C. E. Rawls</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Address: <u>11438 Coleman Rd.</u>		Gulfport, MS	
City: <u>GULFPORT</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39503</u>	January 8, 1992

COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
<p>RECEIVED: <u>There is a health hazard from the fish contaminated water, but they are just being thrown to land at the Bogalusa in Louisiana. This will be a negative effect.</u></p>	

COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
<p>Plan. 3B appears to be a wing-worm - strated. It seems the wing worm has spread and but would not affect an amount in any particular manner.</p>	

COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
<p>I do not believe under the current guidelines for T&E species attraction I can be classified as without very negative problems.</p>	

COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
<p>Under current World Conditions I do not think as far as clean picture of long term military training as I believe any project of this magnitude should be studied and justified in light of the number of lives involved.</p>	

COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
<p>I believe in a strong national defense but I believe that training can be obtained out in an area that would not affect an army different basis would be more.</p>	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
William K. Ray

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>William K. Ray</u> Address: <u>Box 16529</u> <u>Hattiesburg</u> <u>MS</u> <u>39462</u> City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
I support the use of the additional land for training of the tank and ground units.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
The economic impact on this area is a very positive influence and needs to be supported and expanded.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
We need to support the Nat'l Guard and their needs in 90-55.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	

311:1 Comment noted. Refer to Misconception 5.

311:2 Comment noted.

311:3 Comment noted.

311:2

311:1

311:3

J.E.H. Robiller

312:1 A complete on foot survey was made of every timber stand potentially suitable for red-cockaded woodpecker colony use. See response to comment 51:16.

312:2 See response to comment 51:15.

312:3 Comment noted. See misconception 5.

312:4 In the present plan, about 19,000 acres are proposed for maneuver use. The larger number, referred to as "gross acres" in several places in the Draft EIS, might have been better termed the "study area." It represents the outer boundary within which acceptable maneuver area was then designated.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT	
<p style="font-size: small; margin-bottom: 10px;">PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND USE FULL NAME</p> <p>Name: <u>Jacobson E.H. Kohler</u></p> <p>Address: <u>402 Flinders Ave</u> <u>Pan Christian MS 39571</u></p> <p>City: _____ State: <u>MS</u> Zip: <u>39571</u></p>	<p>Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Gulfport, MS January 8, 1992</p>
<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____</p> <p>I am against any Expansion or Addition use of Federal controlled Forest lands or new in use.</p>	<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____</p> <p>Publicly for this Meeting was inadequate.</p>
<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____</p> <p>Before any Expansion is permitted a square foot by square foot survey should be made to insure that no Endangered Species such as Wood- pecker ect exist. No Road Survey as now used.</p>	<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____</p> <p>If only 22,000 Acres are to be used my ask for 38,000.</p>
<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____</p>	<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____</p>
<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____</p>	<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____</p>

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

1 Jochen Robiller
2 402 Fleitas Avenue
3 Pass Christian, Mississippi 39571

4 I'm against any further expansion at Camp Shelby for
5 the following reasons: that I don't believe that there is
6 good enough survey has been done in regards to endangered
7 species and wildlife. All the information I have read says
8 it's been done by road survey, for instance, the endangered
9 woodpeckers or what have you.

10 Another comment that I have is that if we hear that the
11 camp -- Army is only going to use twenty-two thousand acres,
12 why are they asking for thirty-eight thousand acres. Why
13 not change the configuration and, you know, not add that
additional land. That's my major comment.

312:5 See response to comment 312:3.

312:6 See response to comment 312:1.

312:7 All land within the newly proposed tracked vehicle maneuver areas is now
within the existing Camp Shelby special use permit area. No transfer of title is
requested. Also, see response to comment 312:4.

312:5

312:6

312:7

James A. Rogers

313:1 There should be no discernable changes from the present, either positive or negative, with any of the action alternatives (1 through 4).

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT	
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRINT FULLY	
<p>Name: <u>JAMES A. ROGERS</u></p> <p>Address: <u>417 WALNUT ST.</u></p>	<p>Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings</p> <p>Hattiesburg, MS</p> <p>January 9, 1992</p>
<p>City: <u>HATTIESBURG</u> State: <u>MS</u> Zip: <u>39401</u></p>	
<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>1</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>Forest & Riverine Area</u></p>	
<p><u>I have concerns in landowner area since 26-27 Range 12 W. It is close to Camp Shelby Lake and impact of area. I was wondering what will that site proposed would have on Lye</u></p>	
<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____</p>	
<p>_____</p>	
<p>_____</p>	
<p>_____</p>	
<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____</p>	
<p>_____</p>	
<p>_____</p>	
<p>COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____</p>	
<p>_____</p>	
<p>_____</p>	

CESAR Form 1164-3 (One-Time)

Dec 91

Page _____ of _____

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Brett Shank

- 314:1 The impact area represents an arbitrary outer boundary. The actual impact points of artillery and mortar rounds is normally more than 1000 meters (6/10 mile) inside the outer boundary.
- 314:2 The regular land management program reseeds and fertilizes areas which have been used for heavy maneuver training.
- 314:3 The question of woody debris applies only to the initial clearing of the new maneuver areas. In those areas, the debris will be left to decay in place, with the remaining disturbed area seeded. In annual repair, only the areas damaged during training are disked and seeded, and not every acre requires extensive repair each year.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Name: <u>Brett Shank (OK Design)</u>	City: <u>Gulfport, MS</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39574</u>
Address: <u>25553 Hilltop Rd</u>	City: <u>Savner</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39574</u>
DATE: <u>January 8, 1992</u>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
In the draft, page 3-80, 3.2.2 4.1 it refers to a 1200 square ft woody debris left for the wildlife but in the rehabilitation program (ITAM) it is said that the area will be cleared by diskling then the soil will be replanted with grass. My question is how can the woody debris be left for the wildlife if the area is cleared and disked? on the off season with the tanks are not in use.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
Concerning soil preservation --- after extensive use of the land and then rehabilitation the earth is disked and the soil then becomes un fertile.			
Addressing the impact zone and miscommunication the gopher tortoise colonies are situated directly out of the boundaries of the impact zone. If there was a miscommunication in a unit on any sides of the impact zone serious artificial damage could be done to the colonies of the gopher tortoise. ①			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Frances Simmons

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRINT FULLY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meeting	
Name: <u>Frances Simmons</u>			
Address: <u>6518 W. 5. Hwy 49</u>			
City: <u>Hattiesburg</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39401</u>	Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
<u>Comments in the area need decrease</u>			
<u>without the continued training at Camp</u>			
<u>Shelby.</u>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
<u>I would fully support Alternative #1</u>			
<u>for extended training & maneuvers.</u>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
<u>I feel we need the jobs & monetary</u>			
<u>which is afforded us by Camp Shelby</u>			
<u>to protect the economic growth</u>			
<u>of this area.</u>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		

315:1 Comment noted.
315:2 Comment noted.
315:3 Comment noted.

315:2

315:1

315:3

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Larry Sisk

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PREPARE FRANKY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992	
Name: <u>Larry W. Sisk</u>			
Address: <u>17 Ruth Ezell Rd.</u>			
<u>HATTIESBURG MS 39401</u>			
City: _____	State: _____	Zip: _____	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 1 RESOURCE AREA: ALL			
WHAT IS GOOD FOR CAMP SHELBY IS GOOD FOR HATTIESBURG. NO QUESTIONS ASKED.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____			
IN FOREST CO. THE CAP PROGRAM (1986) 3386 ACRES WERE PLANTED IN PINE AC PROGRAM (1991) 110 ACRES IN EIP PROGRAM (1991) 113 ACRES. 1990 TOTALS (257.5 ACRES) ASSES PROGRAM WERE PLANTED IN PINE, DOES NOT INCLUDE FORESTRY SERVICE PLANTING			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____			
DOES NOT INCLUDE GRASSY CO. CONCLUSION: THERE ARE PLANTY OF TREES TO REPLACE REPLACE TREES IN CLEAR CUTS			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____			
WE HAVE THE BEST FIGHTING FORCE IN THE WORLD LETS KEEP IT THAT WAY.			
CUT THE DAMN TREES!			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____			

316:1 Comment noted.

316:2 Comment noted.

316:3 Comment noted.

316:1

316:2

316:3

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

COMMENTS BY LARRY SISK

17 Ruth Ezell Road

Hattiesburg, Mississippi

BY MR. SISK:

It is my opinion that what is good for
Camp Shelby is good for Hattiesburg. As far as
the trees, cut the damn trees. We've got the
finest military force in the world. I want to
keep it that way. Anybody that wants to save the
trees or the gopher tortoise can take them to
Iraq. As far as I'm concerned, we do not need the
trees. We've got the ASCS program, and we've got
the Forestry Service that replants acres and
acres. What few trees they're going to cut, we
don't need. Thank you very much.

316:4

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Susan A. Slade

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

<p>PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PREPARE</p> <p>Name: <u>SUSAN A. SLADE</u></p> <p>Address: <u>P.O. Box 143</u></p> <p><u>PURVIS</u> <u>MS</u> <u>39475</u></p> <p>City: State: Zip:</p>		<p>Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Gulfport, MS January 8, 1992</p>
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
	<p>I fully support Camp Shelby because of the jobs it provides. It is a valuable economic asset to several surrounding counties.</p>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
	<p>The hunting will still be there. Some species could be enhanced by the use of the land.</p>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
	<p>The timber industry will profit.</p>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
	<p>I support this Camp Shelby proposal because of the significant need for this type of training for our National Defense by the National Guard. It is necessary.</p>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
	<p>Camp Shelby will be replanting and rehabilitating the areas after use. The overall effects will be positive.</p>	

317:1 Comment noted.
317:2 Comment noted.
317:3 Comment noted.
317:4 Comment noted.
317:5 Comment noted.

317:5

317:4

317:2

317:3

317:1

Nola I. Smee

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PREPARE FINAL Name: <u>Nola I. Smee</u> Address: <u>15708 Little Joe Road</u> City: <u>Biloxi</u> State: <u>MS</u> Zip: <u>39532</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Gulfport, MS January 8, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	The vast areas allocated to Camp Shelby (I flew within sight of it only last week) have to be adequate for any justifiable tank maneuvering at this point in time. The performance of U.S. tanks in Desert Storm and the reduction in military threats and budgets do not justify the permanent (or even temporary) destruction of the environment and the loss of timber industry-related jobs.
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mrs. Frances Price Smith

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>Mrs. Frances Price Smith</u> Address: <u>401 S. 21st Ave.</u> <u>Hattiesburg, MS 39401</u> City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>1</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>Natural Resources</u> I am concerned with what is going to happen to the animals that are not protected by the endangered species list. I realize that the EIS addresses this on pgs 3-80 but I want assurance there is no way the animals will be lost.	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>2</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>Natural Resources</u> Even though the EIS states that information will be contributed to the training on pgs 124-125, I am concerned that the information will not be done and I want assurance that this will be done and	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>3</u> RESOURCE AREA: <u>Natural Resources</u> I am concerned about the aesthetic effect these tanks will have on a beautiful area. I realize this expansion will benefit the area economically but there are a lot of other aspects of life that we must consider also, including the aesthetic and cultural development of our children.

319:1 Efforts were made to minimize habitat loss (e.g. to reduce fragmentation) for non-protected species where possible, at the same time adhering to recommendations regarding T&E species management. It is clear that not all species will benefit from the same management guidelines, and improving or maintaining habitat for T&E species will not benefit some non-target species. Please see Section 3.3.2.4 and response to comments 2:132 and 21:3.

319:2 Please see response to comments 7:4, 7:17, and 7:24.

319:3 See response to comment 21:6 and general misconception statements 5 and 25.

319:1

319:2

319:3

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Charles Speed

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>Charles Speed</u> Address: <u>341 Ralph Rauls Rd</u> <u>Hattiesburg</u> <u>MS</u> <u>39402</u> City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO.: _____ RESOURCE AREA: <u>Natural Resources</u> <u>While wildlife may be temporarily driven from the</u> <u>area during periods of use will not the extensive seeding</u> <u>provide beautiful food for increased numbers of wildlife</u> <u>during other periods?</u>	COMMENT/QUESTION NO.: _____ RESOURCE AREA: <u>Ensnamic</u> <u>A loss of timber related jobs doesn't seem as</u> <u>urgent as the immediate loss of the hundreds of</u> <u>military jobs which would occur if the area isn't</u> <u>provided to the military.</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO.: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____	COMMENT/QUESTION NO.: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO.: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____	COMMENT/QUESTION NO.: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO.: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____	COMMENT/QUESTION NO.: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____	

320:1 Comment noted. See response to comment 21:5 and misconceptions 3, 5, and 25.

320:2 Comment noted. Some wildlife species will benefit from this type of vegetative ground cover. Among those species thought to be attracted to these areas is the gopher tortoise (USFWS 1992 biological opinion, page 12, reproduced in Appendix L of the Final EIS).

320:2

320:1

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Allen T. Steed

321:1 Comment noted. Please see misconception 5.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>Allen T. Steed</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Address: <u>588 Leeville Rd</u>		Hattiesburg, MS	
City: <u>Atoka</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>38465</u>	January 8, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
<p>As though they want the move to expand the Army Shelby Tank Maneuver Area. Shelby is too important economically to risk any reduction in usage. The move usage of Camp Shelby. The move would be a disaster.</p>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
<p>As well as provided a recreational resource used as hunting. The maintenance program they announced the day and under threaten to one of the best in the South. Target the objectives and the results. We need more jobs possible in this area.</p>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Richard M. Stone

322:1 Comment noted.

322:1

574

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FAIRLY		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992	
Name: <u>RICHARD M. STONE</u>			
Address: <u>1216 MARIE ST</u>			
City: <u>HATTIESBURG MS</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39407</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
<u>I STRONGLY SUPPORT AS #1 AND VOTE A</u>			
<u>SOLID RECOMMENDATION OF THIS ISSUE</u>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Garland W. Sullivan

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>Garland W. Sullivan</u> Address: <u>207 N. 22nd Ave</u> <u>Hattiesburg, MS 39401</u> City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 1 RESOURCE AREA: <u>General Topics</u> For the betterment of our armed forces we should allow the expansion of their training at Camp Shelby. Recent experience in Iraq offers evidence of the importance of ARVN in ground warfare.	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 2 RESOURCE AREA: <u>Economics</u> The City of Hattiesburg and surrounding communities gain tremendously from the payroll of permanent party as well as visiting units coming here for regular training. Expanding the base number areas will help our Camp Shelby	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 3 RESOURCE AREA: <u>Natural Resources</u> The US Army has committed itself to save the environment by exercising good judgment and making funds available for monitoring and repairing man-made damage as needed.
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____	COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____ RESOURCE AREA: _____

324:2 Comment noted.

CESAM Form 1164-3 (One-Time)
 Dec 91

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

325:1 Comment noted. Please also see misconception statements 3 and 25.

[illegible]

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Mark W. Thomas, Sr.

326:1 Comment noted.

326:2 Comment noted.

326:1

326:2

578

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FINELY Name: <u>MARK W. THOMAS SR</u> Address: <u>728 BERKSHIRE DR</u> <u>HATTIESBURG, MS 39402</u> City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA: <u>ECONOMICS</u>	
<u>I support the National Guard's request</u> <u>for use of DNF for BN size armor</u> <u>tng, due to the possibility of numerous</u> <u>jobs being lost if units must go elsewhere</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA: <u>TO TRAIN</u>	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA: <u>NATURAL RESOURCES</u>	
<u>I feel the National Guard is comitted</u> <u>to protection & preservation of natural</u> <u>resources. There can be tng and</u> <u>environment protection in the same area</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA: _____	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA: _____	

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FIRMLY

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SIDE		PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND PRESS FIRMLY	
Name: <u>Elaine Tisack</u> Address: <u>799 Mars Hill Rd.</u> <u>Wissamin, Ms.</u> State: <u>Ms.</u> Zip: <u>39577</u> City: _____		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings Hattiesburg, MS January 9, 1992	
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
<u>My father and I were at 30 the Main resource</u> <u>then in a meeting w/ Mr. My father asked in the trailer</u> <u>facility. My life has evolved around land, forests & wildlife</u> <u>all we people need this trailer - we should all work together.</u>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:		

CESAM Form 1164-3 (One-Time)
Dec 91

Page _____ of _____

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Sam Tisack

328:1 Please see response to comment 63:30.

328:2 Please see response to comment 51:14.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>SAM TISACK</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings
Address: <u>799 MARSH BLVD ROAD</u>		Hattiesburg, MS
City: <u>WILSON</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	January 9, 1992
Zip: <u>39577</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO. RESOURCE AREA:		
<p>My land was targeted for Phase 5 acquisition. I received a letter indicating the National Guard's desire to purchase this land several years ago, however since then I've heard nothing. My land lies between PTA 1 and PTA 2. What is the status of the Phase 5 acquisition? The letter stated it would be to my advantage to sell at that time.</p>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO. RESOURCE AREA:		
<p>Why is it not desirable today to sell - why not buy it now?</p>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO. RESOURCE AREA:		
<p>My land is not for sale.</p> <p>What effect would implementing the proposed training areas 1 & 2 have on adjacent property value? I've assumed that the value of my property will decrease. No provision has been made to evaluate the effect of PTA 1 & 2 on property value.</p>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO. RESOURCE AREA:		

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Gene Touchstone

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>Gene Touchstone</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings
Address: <u>148 Ace Oaklisk Rd</u>		Hattiesburg, MS
City: <u>RICHTON</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	January 8, 1992
Zip: <u>39476</u>		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>1</u>	RESOURCE AREA: <u>Regional Economy/employment</u>	
I strongly desire that Alternative #1 be chosen as the option for the SUP. My reason is the economic impact positive, it would have on South Mississippi. The potential for any loss of employment in this area.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: _____	RESOURCE AREA: _____	
would be a detriment on the economy.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>2</u>	RESOURCE AREA: <u>Natural Resources</u>	
the use of ITAM program would have a beneficial impact on Natural Resources, especially if it is fully implemented.		
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: <u>3</u>	RESOURCE AREA: <u>Military Training</u>	
Due to the unstable of an certain situation in the world governments today a fully trained military able to react swiftly to changing situations would enhance our abilities to react to these situations, when needed.		

329:1 Comment noted. Please also see misconception 25.
329:2 Comment noted.
329:3 Comment noted. Please also see response to comment 2:6.

329:1

329:2

329:3

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
G.D. Williamson

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

COMMENTS BY G. D. WILLIAMSON

1216 Elks Lake Road
Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39401

BY MR. WILLIAMSON:

I'm gonna first say I'm a hundred percent for the expansion of Camp Shelby. And I feel like that we can train soldiers, grow pine trees and all. And I'm also for the environmentalists. But knowing the Army and the National Guard like I do, we can still have good environmentalists. I think I can assure you that any erosion will be corrected immediately. And economically, we need it, but also I sleep more comfortable when all the troops are down there, because we're close to Cuba, you know. So we need it as a national defense training center also.

I taken basic training there in 1945, didn't think I'd ever be out here fighting for it. I thought I'd be fighting against it, but I'm for it. I think we need it.

330:1.

330:2

330:3

330:1 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 10:5 and 14:46 and general misconception statement 5.

330:2 Comment noted. See response to comment 25:4,5.

330:3 Comment noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
J.F. Tatum

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

COMMENTS BY J. F. TATUM

2600 Mimosa Lane
Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39401

BY MR. TATUM:

1	Let me see what I want to say. From	
2	my study of the environmental impact study, I am	
3	fully convinced that there's no damage which will	331:1
4	occur to the environment in our area because of	
5	the National Guard taking on this additional	
6	acreage. Therefore, I am very significantly in	
7	favor of the expansion of the property to	
8	accentuate the training facilities of Camp Shelby	
9	in Hattiesburg.	
10	The National Guard has proven over the	
11	years to be a significant economic addition to the	331:2
12	City of Hattiesburg and the surrounding area. The	
13	use of this facility, according to the National	
14	Guard, is necessary to our national defense and	
15	for the development of our armed forces in the	
16	particular training that they will be engaged in	
17	at Camp Shelby. My observation of the National	331:3
18	Guard men, as they have moved in and out of	
19	Hattiesburg over the years, has been that they are	
20	of exemplary character and serve as a significant	
21	addition to our community.	
22	I sincerely hope you will see fit to	331:4
23	approve this addition for our Camp Shelby National	
24	Guard training area.	
25		

331:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 5.
331:2 Comment noted.
331:3 Comment noted. Please also see the response to comment 2:6.
331:4 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 5 and 12.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Gene Walters

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>GENE WALTERS</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Address: <u>#1 PONDEROSA DR.</u>		Hattiesburg, MS	
City: <u>MEMPHIS</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39465</u>	January 9, 1992

COMMENT/QUESTION NO:	RESOURCE AREA:
332:1	Economics
332:2	Visitors Activities, Lodging, Restaurants
332:3	Local Business
332:4	Vital to Economic Growth
332:5	
332:6	
332:7	
332:8	
332:9	
332:10	
332:11	
332:12	
332:13	
332:14	
332:15	
332:16	
332:17	
332:18	
332:19	
332:20	
332:21	
332:22	
332:23	
332:24	
332:25	
332:26	
332:27	
332:28	
332:29	
332:30	
332:31	
332:32	
332:33	
332:34	
332:35	
332:36	
332:37	
332:38	
332:39	
332:40	
332:41	
332:42	
332:43	
332:44	
332:45	
332:46	
332:47	
332:48	
332:49	
332:50	
332:51	
332:52	
332:53	
332:54	
332:55	
332:56	
332:57	
332:58	
332:59	
332:60	
332:61	
332:62	
332:63	
332:64	
332:65	
332:66	
332:67	
332:68	
332:69	
332:70	
332:71	
332:72	
332:73	
332:74	
332:75	
332:76	
332:77	
332:78	
332:79	
332:80	
332:81	
332:82	
332:83	
332:84	
332:85	
332:86	
332:87	
332:88	
332:89	
332:90	
332:91	
332:92	
332:93	
332:94	
332:95	
332:96	
332:97	
332:98	
332:99	
332:100	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Tom White

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>Tom White</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS	
Address: <u>2312 Ellis Plechant Rd</u>		Public Comment Meetings	
City: <u>Memphis</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Place: <u>Camp Shelby</u>	Date: <u>1/8/52</u>
Zip: <u>38101</u>			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:		RESOURCE AREA:	
I am against any option which in any way changes the land use or limits the use of Leaf River WMA because of the short term and long term impact on wildlife.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:		RESOURCE AREA:	
Am against changing the access or number of days that the WMA can be used because it will affect the sportswoman in south Mississippi in a negative way. This will also have a negative impact on the economy in Mississippi.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:		RESOURCE AREA:	
Am against the way the FIS was handled. An independent group was not used to do the study. The Army Corps of Engineers should not have been used because they are biased towards the National Guard.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:		RESOURCE AREA:	
I am against against the method by which the Army + National Guard has decided the public by calling this the "Continued use of Deseat Nat. Forest" when that is not the issue. The issue is whether or not and by how much the Army designs Leaf River WMA.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO:		RESOURCE AREA:	
I will oppose any congressman that supports any action which allows the use of Leaf River WMA in any way.			

334:1 Comment noted. Please see response to comments 10:1 and 63:5.

334:2 Comment noted.

334:3 Comment Noted. A detailed treatment of the history of the LRWMA was developed for the Final EIS. See Section 2.4.6 of the Final EIS. Please refer to response to comment 51:15 and misconceptions 5, 8, 9, 10, 14, 17, 23, and 24.

334:4 Comment noted. No major changes are proposed. See response to comments 21:8, 102:5, and 235:1.

334:5 Comment noted. See response to comment 334:3.

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

16 Tom White
17 2313 Ellis Merchant Road
18 Pascagoula, Mississippi 39581

19 I'm against any option which in any way changes the
20 land use or limits the use of Leaf River Wildlife Management
21 Area because of the short-term and/or long-term impact on
22 wildlife.

23 And I'm also against changing the access and number of
24 days that the Wildlife Management Area can be used, and
25 that's the gist of it.

1 But one thing I'm going to go ahead and say, and you
2 can put it in there, is the information the military sent
3 out and the way they printed it in the paper refers to this
4 whole thing as continued military use of DeSoto National
5 Forest Lands at Camp Shelby. And I disagree with that.
6 That is not the issue.

7 The issue here is whether or not they're going to
8 impose and start using part of Leaf River Wildlife
9 Management Area, that is the public problem not the
10 continued use of the entire forest. They have been using
11 that, and everybody knows they'll continue to use that.

12 And something else I'm going to say is I'm normally for
13 national defense and national defense spending. This is the
14 first time in my life I've ever been against it. But if
15 this thing in any way goes through, I'll be against military
16 spending from this day forward.

17 And one other thing, I voted for Trent Lott and Gene
18 Taylor. I voted for both of them. But if this thing goes
19 through, I'll also oppose them in any way that I can. I'm
through.

334:6

334:7

334:8

334:9

334:10

334:6 Comment noted. See response to comment 334:3.

334:7 Comment noted. See response to comment 334:4.

334:8 Comment noted. See response to comment 334:3.

334:9 Comment noted.

334:10 Comment noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Rodney G. Wilkinson

335:1 Comment noted. Please also see response to comments 3:12, 10:5, 14:46 and 17:5 and misconceptions 9, 14, and 17.

335:2 Comment noted.

COMMENT SHEET - TURN THIS SHEET IN WHEN YOU EXIT

Name: <u>RODNEY G. WILKINSON</u>		Camp Shelby Training Site Special Use Permit Draft EIS Public Comment Meetings	
Address: <u>401 HARRIS DR</u>		Gulfport, MS	
City: <u>GULFPORT</u>	State: <u>MS</u>	Zip: <u>39503</u>	January 8, 1992
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 1 RESOURCE AREA: GENERAL TOPICS			
I oppose the use of the land by heavy mechanized equipment because it will destroy the forest, the roads and the waterways. There will be no mechanism it cannot be used for anything else.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 2 RESOURCE AREA: RECREATION			
The use of heavy tanks in the area will run most will game out. Destroying the forest will compound the damage. Cranes will destroy the stream for fishing.			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 3 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 4 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 5 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 6 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 7 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 8 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 9 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 10 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 11 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 12 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 13 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 14 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 15 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 16 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 17 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 18 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 19 RESOURCE AREA:			
COMMENT/QUESTION NO: 20 RESOURCE AREA:			

336:1 Comment noted.

[illegible]

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Sydney Anderson

338:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 5 and 12.

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

COMMENTS BY SYDNEY ANDERSON

716 Grace Avenue

Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39401

BY MS. ANDERSON:

I'm in support of Camp Shelby and the
good that it does for the City of Hattiesburg and
the surrounding areas, and they need the
additional space. I think they need to get it.

338:1

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

339:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 5.

339:2 Comment noted.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

COMMENTS BY CHARLES EPPLING

1320 North Main

Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39401

BY MR. EPPLING:

I've worked at Camp Shelby for about four years, and I've worked with the M60A3 or M60A3 jet team, which is a tank training team. And I'm also very occupied with the museum that's doing restoration-type work. And I've noticed a lot of the hassle and debate over the additional land's been based on the M-1 tank, and everybody acts like it's some type of monster that's just going to eat up the forest.

So I did a little researching. And 50 years ago during World War II, Camp Shelby was training very heavily with the Sherman tanks, and in World War II Camp Shelby was 400,000 acres at

that time, and that engulfed most of DeSoto National Forest. And during research, the World War II tanks actually had more ground pressure than what the modern day M-1 tank has. And it's my feeling that if DeSoto Forest survived the training back in World War II and it's in the condition that it's in now, that surely the M-1 tank won't do as much damage to the environment.

339:1

339:2

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Robert Myers, Jr.

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

COMMENTS BY ROBERT T. MYERS, JR.

Post Office Box 1464

Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39403

BY MR. MYERS:

Well, I would like to say, first of all, that I'm one hundred percent in favor of the continuing expansion of Camp Shelby in all phases, both in hard facilities and land expansion. I put economic development of the State of Mississippi far ahead of hunting and fishing and bird watching and gopher watching.

I'm not insensitive to environmental issues in that I have fought pollution control of our waters and streams all my life. However, the economic development of the area is fundamentally more important than these pleasures that individuals, a few individuals, would derive out of walking through the woods hunting, shooting animals, watching birds, and other things that might take place in that type of an environment.

For the environmentalists, I would recommend that the government and the people that are behind the expansion of Camp Shelby also consider that it would be possible to buy up additional lands outside of the Camp Shelby area and convert them to park uses, park wilderness uses, for use of the general public, in much the

340:1 Comment noted. See general misconception statement 5.

340:2 Comment noted. Refer to misconception 25.

340:3 Comment noted. See general misconception statements 5, 10, 12, and 22.

340:1

340:2

340:3

1 same way as they're using Leaf River Management
2 area and other areas that Camp Shelby needs for
3 expansion at this time.

340:3

4 And if I had my way, I would say they
5 should proceed immediately with the construction
6 down there and quit arguing about it and let's get
7 this program on the road. I'll stand behind
8 that.

340:4

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Leo Potvin

The following comments were received
by a certified court reporter as the
oral comments of:

COMMENTS BY LEO POTVIN

683 Lynn Ray Road

Petal, Mississippi 39465

BY MR. POTVIN:

I have a very brief statement. The
statement is this: I'm an Audubon member,
national and local, and all I have to say is all
Audubon members are not pink, period.

341:1

And another thing, if you want to run
them tanks right up and down Hardy Street, it's
fine with me. Anything for the boys in green.

341:2

341:1 Comment noted.

341:2 Comment noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Henry E. Thompson

342:1 Comment noted. Please also see added coverage in FEIS in Sections 1.1.2.1 and 1.1.2.3.

1) Henry E. Thompson phone # 2311-N-5th AVE. 428-8256 LAUREL MS 39400
COMMENTS ON CAMP SHELBY
TRAINING LAND FOR BATTILION
TANK TRAINING.
FOR SEVERAL YEARS NOW
THE ARMY HAS BEEN TRYING TO
GET ENOUGH LAND TO PROPERLY
TRAIN ITS NATIONAL GUARD
AND ACTIVE DUTY TANK UNITS.
YOU MIGHT QUESTION ACTIVE
DUTY UNITS IN 1980 A TANK
UNIT FROM FORT KNOX KY.
THE 5/33 ARMOR
CAME TO CAMP SHELBY WITH ALL
ITS EQUIPMENT TO TRAIN
UNIT & BATOONS.
I AM SURE OTHER REGULAR ARMY
TANK UNITS HAVE ALSO TRAINED
HERE.
AS YOU KNOW DURING THE
DESERT SHIELD/STORM BUILD UP
THE 155th ARMORED BRIGADE
HAD TO GO TO TEXAS &
CALIF. TO TAKE THEIR
TRAINING.
IF THE TRAINING AREA
AT CAMP SHELBY COULD HAVE
INCREASED WHEN THE
UNIT FIRST ASKED FOR IT

342:1

342:2 Comment noted. Preparers believe that no significant change in forest resources will result, as discussed in Sections 3.3.2.3 and 3.3.4.3 of the FEIS. Please also see general misconception 9.

342:3 Comment noted.

HENRY E. THOMPSON

IT IS POSSIBLE THAT THE ISSUE AROUND BY BADE WOULD HAVE BEEN READY TO PERFORM ITS ASSIGNED MISSION

342:1

INSTEAD OF BEING DELAYED IN CALL UP & HAVING TO GO TO TEXAS & CALIF. AT GREAT EXPENSE TO THE TAXPAYERS.

IT IS DISGUSTING TO PICK UP ANY NEWS PAPER IN THE AREA AND PLASTENED ALL OVER THEM ARE ARTICLES WRITTEN BY SO CALLED SPECIALIST ABOUT THE GREAT DRAMAS IT WILL CAUSE TO THE FOREST.

342:2

CAMP SHELBY IS A VITAL SOURCE OF INCOME FOR THE STATE AND THE AREAS AROUND IT.

LOOKS LIKE THE PEOPLE LIKE "LOUIE MILLER, PETE DENTON AND OTHERS LIKE THEM HAVE THEM OWN THE LAND IT IS OWNED BY YOU + NOT HUNTING GROUPS, BIENNA CLUBS

342:3

Henry E. Thompson

SON GRAPES RETIRED LT. COL. ~~GRAPES~~
(WONDER WHERE HE SLEEPS)
I AM ALSO A RETIRED ARMY
WITH OVER 20 YEARS OF
REGULAR ARMY SERVICE (NOT
RESERVE OR NATIONAL GUARD)
WE NEED THE TANKS
TRAINING WERE NOT OTHER
STATES.

PETE DENTON, STATES IN
THE "CHRONICLE" OF 6th JAN.
1992 THAT THE MILITARY
CAN'T PROVE TO US WHAT THE
MISSION IS NOW. IT IS NONE
OF HIS BUSINESS WHAT THE
PRESENT MISSION IS NOW.

IT WOULD BE INTERESTED
JUST WHERE THESE PEOPLE
GET THE FUNDS TO SUPPORT THEM.
SEVERAL WEEKS AGO THERE
WERE SEVERAL ARTICLES BY
A PERSON WHO DOES NOT LIVE
IN MISS. NOW ABOUT HIS
GRAND FATHER WORKING TO
HELP PLANT THE NATIONAL FOREST
HE DID NOT MENTION THE
PROTEST (IT WAS THE B-C
P.C.C.) HIS FATHER LIKE

342:4

AT LOT OF FATHERS + BROTHERS
WERE GLAD TO GET TO WORK
IN THE LATTER PART OF THE
1930 + EARLY 1940.
FROM THE ARTICLES, HIS FATHER
AND FAMILY MUST HAVE
CONTINUED TO LIVE OFF THE
TAX PAYERS AND STILL DO IT
FROM WHAT I GOT OUT OF THE
ARTICLE.

Wm. E. Brown

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF
Merle Spann

Page 2

MERLE SPANN
36 TALLY ARMS
GULFPORT, MS 39501

Copies of the document can be reviewed at selected libraries

in Biloxi, Beaumont, Gulfport, New Augusta, Hattiesburg, Laurel, Hancock County, McClain, Jackson-Hinds and Stone County. To find out which branches in your area have copies of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, please contact your main library.

The National Guard Bureau of the Department of the Army has proposed that the U.S. Forest Service reissue a special use permit for the continued use of approximately 116,000 acres of land for military training purposes. The proposal does not seek additional lands from those currently covered under a special use permit, but it does involve reconfiguring a portion of the existing training area within the DeSoto National Forest to allow for tracked vehicle maneuver training.

The Draft EIS includes detailed discussions of the six land use alternatives, focusing on the direct and indirect environmental impacts of each.

The Department of the Army is the proponent of the Draft EIS with the U.S. Forest Service and the Mississippi National Guard as cooperating agencies.

For additional information on the Public Open Houses, contact Colonel James Jones of the Mississippi Military Department at 973-6395.

1. Have copy of Draft EIS 2 Dec Sierra
2. Land Swap poorly presented at first 8 343:1
- EIS Summary sounds like author who is education & whole thing needs a single map to tie it together.
3. 31 Dec letter from state AG mentions in passing that no additional lands sought. This should be your whole theme. 343:2
4. Know your enemy. They delayed ID for 10 years. Almost won.

343:1 Comment noted. Several additional maps have been incorporated in the FEIS to assist public understanding of the proposed actions. Please also see general misconception number 12.

343:2 Comment noted. The fact that no additional land is to be added to Camp Shelby is the topic covered in general misconception number 5.